arXiv:1704.07213v1 [math.SG] 24 Apr 2017

LAGRANGIAN FIBERS OF GELFAND-CETLIN SYSTEMS

YUNHYUNG CHO, YOOSIK KIM, AND YONG-GEUN OH

ABSTRACT. For a given complex n-dimensional partial flag manifold $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ equipped with the Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form ω_λ, the *Gelfand-Cetlin system* $\Phi_\lambda : \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is a completely integrable system on $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ whose image is a convex polytope $\triangle_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, which is called the *Gelfand-Cetlin polytope*.

In the first part of this paper, we are concerned with the topology of Gelfand-Cetlin fibers. We first show that every Gelfand-Cetlin fiber is an isotropic submanifold of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ and it is an iterated bundle where the fiber at each stage is either a point or a product of odd dimensional spheres. Then, we classify all Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers. Also, we show that every fiber over a point lying on the relative interior of an r-dimensional face of $\triangle_\lambda$ has a trivial r-dimensional torus factor, i.e., the diffeomorphic type is $(S^1)^r \times Y$ for some smooth manifold Y. Furthermore, we show that a toric degeneration of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda)$ into the Gelfand-Cetlin toric variety can be understood as a fiberwise degeneration $(S^1)^r \times Y \to (S^1)^r$ by contracting Y to a point.

The second part is devoted to detect displaceable and non-displaceable Lagrangian fibers. We discuss a couple of combinatorial and numerical tests for displaceability of fibers. As a byproduct, all non-torus Lagrangian fibers of $\mathrm{Gr}(2, p)$ for every prime number p are shown to be displaceable. We then prove that the Gelfand-Cetlin system on every complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(n)$ $(n \geq 3)$ with a monotone ω_λ carries a continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian torus fibers and several non-displaceable Lagrangian non-torus fibers. As a special case, the Lagrangian S^3-fiber in $\mathcal{F}(3)$ is non-displaceable, the question of which was raised by Nohara-Ueda who computed its Floer cohomology to be zero.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction 1

Part 1. Topology of Gelfand-Cetlin fibers 7
2. The Gelfand-Cetlin systems 7
3. Ladder diagram and its face structure 11
4. Classification of Lagrangian fibers 14
5. Iterated bundle structures on Gelfand-Cetlin fibers 24
6. Degenerations of fibers to tori 33

Part 2. Non-displaceability of Lagrangian fibers 40
7. Criteria for displaceablility of Gelfand-Cetlin fibers 40
8. Non-displaceable fibers of Gelfand-Cetlin systems 49
9. Lagrangian Floer theory on Gelfand-Cetlin systems 52
10. Decompositions of the gradient of potential function 60
11. Solvability of split leading term equation 72
Appendix A. Calculation of potential function deformed by Schubert cycles 79
References 83

1. INTRODUCTION

A *partial flag manifold* is a smooth projective variety over the field of complex numbers that is homogeneous under a complex linear algebraic group. As it has rich algebraic, combinatorial, and geometric structures, it has been

This work was supported by IBS-R003-D1. The first author was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIP; Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning) (NRF-2017R1C1B5018168).

intensively studied from various fields of mathematics. One of the main research themes on partial flag manifolds is to devise combinatorial gadgets revealing their topology, geometry, and algebraic structures. Following the theme, in this article, we develop combinatorial tools that can be used to study symplectic geometry of partial flag manifolds.

A partial flag manifold arises as the orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ of an element λ in the dual Lie algebra of $\mathfrak{u}(n)$ under the co-adjoint action of the unitary group $U(n)$. It comes with a $U(n)$-invariant Kähler form ω_λ (unique up to scaling), so-called a *Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form*. On a co-adjoint orbit, Guillemin and Sternberg [GS2] build a completely integrable system

$$\Phi_\lambda \colon (\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda) \to \mathbb{R}^{\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_\lambda},$$

which is called the *Gelfand-Cetlin system associated to* λ. The image of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a polytope, denoted by $\triangle_\lambda$ and said to be the *Gelfand-Cetlin polytope associated to* λ.

The first part of this manuscript concerns the topology of the fibers of a system Φ_λ. By the celebrated Arnold-Liouville theorem, the fiber over every interior point, a regular value of Φ_λ, is a Lagrangian torus. Even over each point not in the interior of any Gelfand-Cetlin polytope, the fiber turns out to be a smooth isotropic manifold, see Theorem A. It is notable because there is almost no control on the fiber over a non-regular value of a general completely integrable system. Furthermore, a Gelfand-Cetlin fiber not in the interior can be Lagrangian, that displays one marked difference between Gelfand-Cetlin systems and toric integrable systems (on toric manifolds). Table 1 summarizes similarities and differences between them.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Gelfand-Cetlin fiber</th><th>Toric moment fiber</th></tr>
<tr><td>over any point</td><td colspan="2">isotropic submanifold</td></tr>
<tr><td>over an interior point</td><td colspan="2">Lagrangian torus T^n</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="3">over a point in k-dim face f</td><td colspan="2">$\pi_1 = \mathbb{Z}^k$, $\pi_2 = 0$</td></tr>
<tr><td>$T^k \times Y_f$</td><td>T^k</td></tr>
<tr><td>can be Lagrangian</td><td>can *not* be Lagrangian</td></tr>
</table>

TABLE 1. Features of Gefand-Cetlin fibers and toric fibers

To show the above, we will describe each Gelfand-Cetlin fiber as the total space of the iterated bundle constructed by playing a game with various "LEGO® blocks". A game manual will be provided in Section 4 and 5. The first main result of the article, obtained from the game, is stated as follows.

Theorem A (Theorem 4.12)**.** *Let Φ_λ be the Gelfand-Cetlin system on the co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{u}(n)^*$ and let $\triangle_\lambda$ be the corresponding Gelfand-Cetlin polytope. For any point $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$, the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is an isotropic submanifold of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ and is the total space of an iterated bundle*

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) = E_{n-1} \xrightarrow{p_{n-1}} E_{n-2} \xrightarrow{p_{n-2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{p_2} E_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} E_0 = \text{point}$$

such that the fiber at each stage is either a point or a product of odd dimensional spheres. Two fibers $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_1)$ and $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_2)$ are diffeomorphic if two points u_1 and u_2 are contained in the relative interior of the same face.

Remark 1.1. A Gelfand-Cetlin system is defined on a co-adjoint orbit under the special orthogonal group $SO(n)$. See [GS2]. The authors prove that Theorem A can be generalized to the $SO(n)$-cases. However, in contrast to the A-type case, even dimensional spheres can appear as a factor of the fiber at each stage. See [CK] for more details.

A Gelfand-Cetlin system Φ_λ is known to admit a toric degeneration with control from Φ_λ to a toric integrable system. On the toric degeneration of algebraic varieties in stages constructed by Kogan and Miller [KoM], Nishinou, Nohara and Ueda construct the degeneration (see Section 6) from the Gelfand-Cetlin system Φ_λ into the moment map Φ of the (singular) projective toric variety associated to $\triangle_\lambda$, using W.-D. Ruan's technique [Ru] of

gradient-Hamiltonian flows, see Theorem 1.2 in [NNU1]. Then, we obtain the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\quad\phi\quad} & (X_\lambda, \omega) \\ & {\scriptstyle \Phi_\lambda} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \Phi} & \\ & \triangle_\lambda & \end{array} \tag{1.1}$$

where ϕ is a continuous map from $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ onto X_λ. Moreover, the map ϕ induces a symplectomorphism from $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda)$ to $\Phi^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda)$ where $\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda$ is the interior of $\triangle_\lambda$. As a consequence, one can see that each fiber located at $\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda$ is a Lagrangian torus.

According to work of Batyrev, Ciocan-Fontanine, Kim, and Van Straten [BCKV], this degeneration process given by the map ϕ in (1.1) can be interpreted as (a half of) a *conifold* transition. Namely, through the map ϕ, a partial flag manifold is deformed into a singular toric variety having conifold strata. The following theorem indeed visualizes how each Gelfand-Cetlin fiber degenerates into a toric fiber. Specifically, through ϕ, every odd-dimensional sphere of dimension > 1 appeared in each stage of the iterated bundle $\{E_\bullet\}$ contracts to a point simultaneously and each S^1-factor survives.

Theorem B (Theorem 6.8)**.** *Let* $\mathbf{u}$ *be a point lying on the relative interior of an* r*-dimensional face. Then every* S^1*-factor appeared in any stage of the iterated bundle given in Theorem A comes out as a trivial factor so that*

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong T^r \times B(\mathbf{u})$$

where $B(\mathbf{u})$ *is the iterated bundle obtained from the original bundle by removing all* S^1*-factors. Moreover, the map* $\phi : \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \to \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ *is nothing but the projection* $T^r \times B(\mathbf{u}) \to T^r$ *on the first factor.*

Because of Theorem A, the other fibers located at the interior of a face f are all Lagrangian as soon as the fiber of one single point at the interior of f is Lagrangian. In this sense, it is reasonable to call such a face f a *Lagrangian face*. Since every fiber is isotropic again by Theorem A, in order to show that a face f is Lagrangian, it suffices to check that the dimension of the fiber over a point in the interior of f is exactly the half of the dimension of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$.

By summing up the dimensions of the fibers of $p_\bullet$ in the iterated bundle from Theorem A, the dimension of the total space can be calculated. Yet, constructing the bundle describing a fiber is a little involved, we design a more convenient combinatorial criterion telling whether a given face is Lagrangian or not. To describe this criterion, we explain several combinatorial objects in informal ways or by examples. For the formal definitions and more details, the reader is referred to Section 2, 3, and 4.

Recall that the co-adjoint action on $\mathfrak{u}(n)^*$ can be identified with the conjugate $U(n)$-action on the space $\mathcal{H}_n$ of $(n \times n)$ hermitian matrices. Since a $U(n)$-orbit in $\mathcal{H}_n$ is the set of all hermitian matrices having same spectra, we can denote each orbit by $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ for a non-decreasing sequence of real numbers

$$\lambda := \{\lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_{n_1} > \lambda_{n_1+1} = \cdots = \lambda_{n_2} > \cdots > \lambda_{n_r+1} = \cdots = \lambda_n\},$$

which forms the spectra of a (and hence every) matrix of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. Then $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is simply the orbit in $\mathcal{H}_n$ containing the diagonal matrix I_λ whose i-th diagonal entry is equal to λ_i for every $i = 1, \cdots, n$. By gathering the eigenvalues of the principal minors of the matrix in $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$, the Gelfand-Cetlin system

$$\Phi_\lambda \colon (\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda) \to \mathbb{R}^{\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_\lambda}$$

can be explicitly constructed. The Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ is the set of points in $\{(u_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2} : i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i+j \leq n\}$ satisfying the min-max principle given in (2.7). Here, $u_{i,j}$ is the coordinate recording the i-th largest eiganvalue of the $(i+j-1) \times (i+j-1)$ principal minor of I_λ.

To understand the face structure of a Gelfand-Cetlin polytope, which can be of arbitrary large dimension, it is convenient to employ a *ladder diagram*, see Definition 3.1. Roughly speaking, it is the collection of piled boxes each of which contains a variable $u_{i,j}$ respecting the coordinate system (i, j), which is denoted by Γ_λ. As an example, let us consider the case where $\lambda = \{3, 1, -1, -3\}$. Then the corresponding ladder diagram Γ_λ is given as in Figure 1. We call the red dot the *origin* and the blue dots the *top vertices* of Γ_λ therein. A *positive path* in Γ_λ is a shortest path from the origin to a top vertex in Γ_λ. Then *a face of* Γ_λ is defined as a subgraph γ of Γ_λ such that

(1) γ can be drawn by positive paths,
(2) γ contains all top vertices.



FIGURE 1. Ladder diagram Γ_λ.

The first named author with An and Kim proved the following correspondence.

Theorem 1.2 ([ACK]). *There exists an order-preserving bijection*

$$\{\textit{faces of } \Gamma_\lambda\} \longrightarrow \{\textit{faces of } \triangle_\lambda\}.$$

For each face γ of the ladder diagram Γ_λ, the corresponding face of $\triangle_\lambda$ is contained in the intersection of facets of $\triangle_\lambda$ defined by equating two adjacent variables $u_{i,j}$'s not divided by any positive paths. For instance, the face of $\triangle_\lambda$ corresponding to γ in Figure 1 is supported by the plane given by the equations $u_{1,1} = u_{1,2} = u_{2,2} = u_{2,1}$, and $u_{3,1} = -1$.

To figure out whether a face f is Lagrangian or not, we regard the corresponding face γ in Γ_λ as a *board*. We play a 3D-TETRIS® game, filling it up by the following L-blocks in Figure 2 as much as possible [1] obeying the following rules:

(1) the interiors of two L-blocks must not intersect each other.
(2) the interior of L-block does not contain any piece(edge) of γ.
(3) the *rightmost* edge and the *top* edge of an L-block must be mapped into a piece of positive paths in γ.

If a diagram γ can be covered by L-blocks satisfying $(1), (2)$ and (3), γ is said to be *fillable by L-blocks*.



FIGURE 2. L-blocks.

Now, we state the second main theorem, which gives a complete characterization of Lagrangian faces in terms of faces of Γ_λ.

Theorem C (Corollary 4.23). *A face γ of Γ_λ is Lagrangian if and only if γ is fillable by L-blocks.*



FIGURE 3. Filling by L-blocks.

[1] There is a unique way of filling γ with L-blocks satisfying the restrictions $(1), (2)$ and (3) if possible. Thus, the order of putting L-blocks does not matter.

For example, in Figure 3, we can easily see that γ_1 is Lagrangian, but γ_2 is not Lagrangian. Note that any empty slot in the last picture *cannot* be filled by L_1 because of the rule (3).

In the second part of this article, we detect displaceable and non-displaceable [2] Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers. Besides their intrinsic significance in symplectic topology playing their role as the spine of underlying symplectic manifolds, non-displaceable Lagrangian submanifolds having non-trivial Floer cohomologies (together with deformation data) serve as a candidate for a generating set of the Fukaya category. In these regards, detecting non-displaceable Lagrangians has been one of the central themes in symplectic topology.

In Section 7, we start with our study on displaceability of fibers in Gelfand-Cetlin systems. In the toric case, McDuff [McD] and Abreu-Borman-McDuff [ABM] develop the method of *probes* to detect the displaceable toric fibers. The probe method can be also applied to Lagrangian *torus* fibers in Gelfand-Cetlin systems because they are related to the toric fibers via (1.1), however, it is not applicable to non-torus fibers. In the case where a co-adjoint orbit is $\mathcal{F}(3)$, Pabiniak [Pa] investigates displaceable fibers.

We develop several numerical and combinatorial criteria for detecting displaceable Gelfand-Cetlin fibers which can be applied to *both* torus fibers and non-torus fibers in Gelfand-Cetlin systems. Even though our criteria are not exhaustive to classify all displaceable fibers, it is enough to detect almost all displaceable fibers in that the non-displaceable fibers should be located over a measure zero set of the polytope $\triangle_\lambda$. In particular, we are able to displace all non-torus fibers in some cases.

Theorem D (Corollary 7.14)**.** *Let p be a prime number. Then every non-torus Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fiber of the complex Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(2,p)$ is displaceable.*

From Section 8, we discuss non-displaceable Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers on a complete flag manifold equipped with a monotone Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form.

The existence of a non-displaceable Gelfand-Cetlin fiber follows from the non-displaceable fiber theorem by Entov-Polterovich [EP1], which states that any finite system of Poisson commuting smooth functions on a compact symplectic manifold admits at least one non-displaceable fiber. Nishinou, Nohara and Ueda prove that the fiber over the center of $\triangle_\lambda$ is non-displaceable in [NNU1]. Transporting the holomorphic discs of Maslov index 2 classifed by Cho and the third named author [CO] in X_λ via the flow ϕ in (1.1), they compute the potential function and show the existence of a critical point at the center, which yields non-displaceability of its fiber by [FOOO3].

Recently, the existence of a non-displaceable Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin *non-torus fiber* is shown by Nohara-Ueda [NU2] in the case of complex Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(2,4)$. It admits exactly one Lagrangian face, one-dimensional face, so that we have a one-parameter family of non-toric fibers in it. Amomg them, the fiber at the center of the Lagrangian face is shown to be the only non-displaceable fiber. As far as the authors know, it is the only *non-toric* Gelfand-Cetlin fiber known to be non-displaceable in partial flag manifolds (of type A [3]) so far.

The main theorem of the second part asserts that there is indeed a continuum of non-displaceable torus fibers and moreover several non-displaceable non-torus fibers in some Gelfand-Cetlin systems.

Theorem E (Theorem 8.4 and Theorem 8.6)**.** *Every complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(n)$ equipped with the monotone Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form ω_λ for $n \geq 3$ admits a continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers, any of which are not Hamiltonian isotopic to each other. In particular, it has a finite family of non-displaceable non-torus Lagrangian fibers.*

Remark 1.3. The third named author with Fukaya, Ohta, and Ono [FOOO4] first find a continuum of non-displaceable toric fibers on some compact toric manifolds including a non-monotone toric blowup of $\mathbb{C}P^2$ at two points, see also Woodward [Wo]. Using the degeneration models, they also produce a continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori on $\mathbb{C}P^1 \times \mathbb{C}P^1$ and the cubic surface respectively in [FOOO5] and [FOOO8]. Vianna [Vi] also shows a continuum of non-displaceable tori in $(\mathbb{C}P^1)^{2n}$. In the case of toric orbifolds, dealing with more

[2] A Lagrangian submanifold L is called *displaceable* if there is a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism ϕ such that $L \cap \phi(L) = \emptyset$, and is called *non-displaceable* otherwise.

[3] In some partial flag manifolds of type B and D, there exists a Lagrangian fiber that is non-displaceable because of the purely topological reason.

restrictive classes of Hamiltonian isotopies, non-displaceable toric fibers usually exist in abundance, see Woodwards [Wo], Wilson-Woodwards [WW], and Cho-Poddar [CP].

To show Theorem E, we apply the Lagrangian Floer theory deformed by cycles in the ambient symplectic manifold, developed by the third named author with Fukaya, Ohta, and Ono [FOOO1, FOOO4, FOOO7]. More specifically, we employ Schubert divisors in $\mathcal{F}(n)$ to deform the underlying A_∞-algebra associated to a Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin torus fiber. With the aid of combinatorial description of Schubert cycles by Kogan [Ko] and Kogan-Miller [KoM], the deformed potential function $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ will be calculated. After locating the half-open line segment in the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope whose closure connects the center of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope with the center of a certain Lagrangian face, we show that for each fiber over the interval there exists a deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}$ such that $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ has a critical point in Section 10 and 11. Then, we guarantee non-displaceability of the *non-toric* Lagrangian submanifold realized as the "limit" of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori. One remark is that there might be more than one such Lagrangian face. For instance, the fibers located at two line segments as in Figure 4 will be seen to be non-displaceable in $\mathcal{F}(6) \simeq \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ where $\lambda = (5, 3, 1, -1, -3, -5)$.



FIGURE 4. Positions of non-displaceable Gelfand-Cetlin fiber in $\mathcal{F}(6)$.

We separately state the following theorem, which is the case of $n = 3$ in Theorem E, to emphasize that it completes the classification of non-displaceable Lagrangian fibers on $\mathcal{F}(3)$ by combining Pabiniak's work [Pa]. Also, it gives an answer for the question, which was raised in [NU2] [4], whether or not the Lagrangian 3-sphere in the monotone complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(3)$ is non-displaceable.

Theorem F (Theorem 8.4)**.** *Consider the complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(3)$ equipped with the monotone Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form. Let I be the line segment connecting the center of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ and the vertex the fiber over which is a Lagrangian 3-sphere. Then, that the fiber over $\mathbf{u}$ in $\triangle_\lambda$ is non-displaceable if and only if $\mathbf{u}$ is located at I.*

In particular, the Lagrangian 3-sphere, which is the unique non-torus Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fiber in $\mathcal{F}(3)$, is non-displaceable.

Our study on non-toric Lagrangian submanifolds in a Gefland-Cetlin system is expected to promote understanding of a Lagrangian torus fibration in some cotangent bundles. By applying the Darboux-Weinstein theorem, we carry Gelfand-Cetlin systems to a (local) torus fibration in the cotangent bundle of a Lagrangian submanifold arsing from a Gelfand-Cetlin fiber. Indeed, we are able to construct a plethora of disjoint monotone Lagrangian tori. Moreover, they are sometimes all non-displaceable. It will be discussed in [CKO].

The authors hope that our classification and description of Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers serves as a steping stone for understanding the (monotone) Fukaya category of a partial flag manifold. In general, torus fibers together with bounding cochains are not enough to (split-)generate the Fukaya category. The recent work of Nohara-Ueda in [NU2] however suggests that torus and non-torus Lagrangian fibers having non-zero Floer cohomology are possibly generating the category.

[4] In [NU2], Nohara and Ueda calculate Floer cohomologies of the Lagrangian 3-sphere. It turns out to be zero over the Novikov field so that it does not imply its non-displaceability.

Part 1. Topology of Gelfand-Cetlin fibers

2. The Gelfand-Cetlin systems

In this section, we briefly overview Gelfand-Cetlin systems on partial flag manifolds. Let r be a positive integer and let $\{n_0, n_1, \cdots, n_r, n_{r+1}\}$ be a sequence of non-negative integers such that

$$0 = n_0 < n_1 < n_2 < \cdots < n_r < n_{r+1} = n. \tag{2.1}$$

The *partial flag manifold* $\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ is the space of nested sequences of complex vector subspaces of dimensions $(n_0, n_1, \cdots, n_r, n_{r+1})$ in $\mathbb{C}^n$. That is,

$$\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n) = \{V_\bullet := 0 \subset V_1 \subset \cdots \subset V_r \subset \mathbb{C}^n \mid \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V_i = n_i\}.$$

An element $V_\bullet$ of $\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ is called a *flag*.

Note that $\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ admits a $U(n)$-action induced by the linear $U(n)$-action on $\mathbb{C}^n$. Moreover, the $U(n)$-action on $\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ is transitive and each flag $V_\bullet \in \mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ has an isotropy subgroup isomorphic to $U(k_1) \times \cdots \times U(k_{r+1})$ where

$$k_i = n_i - n_{i-1} \tag{2.2}$$

for $i = 1, \cdots, r+1$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ is a homogeneous space diffeomorphic to $U(n)/(U(k_1) \times \cdots \times U(k_{r+1}))$. In particular, we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n) = n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} k_i^2. \tag{2.3}$$

For notational simplicity, we denote by $\mathcal{F}(n)$ the *complete flag manifold* $\mathcal{F}(1, 2, \cdots, n-1; n)$.

2.1. Description of $\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$: co-adjoint orbit of $U(n)$.

We recall how $\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ arises as a co-adjoint orbit of $U(n)$. Let us consider the conjugate action of $U(n)$ on itself with the unique fixed point $I_n \in U(n)$, the identity matrix, which induces the *adjoint action* Ad on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{n}) = T_{I_n}U(n)$. Note that $\mathfrak{u}(n)$ is the set of skew-hermitian matrices

$$\mathfrak{u}(n) = \{A \in M_n(\mathbb{C}) \mid A^* = -A\}$$

and the adjoint action can be written as

$$\begin{array}{rccc} Ad\colon & U(n) \times \mathfrak{u}(n) & \to & \mathfrak{u}(n) \\ & (M, A) & \mapsto & MAM^*. \end{array}$$

The *co-adjoint action* Ad^* of $U(n)$ is the action on the dual Lie algebra $\mathfrak{u}(n)^*$ induced by Ad, explicitly given by

$$\begin{array}{rccc} Ad^*\colon & U(n) \times \mathfrak{u}(n)^* & \to & \mathfrak{u}(n)^* \\ & (M, X) & \mapsto & X_M \end{array}$$

where $X_M \in \mathfrak{u}(n)^*$ is defined by $X_M(A) = X(M^*AM)$ for every $A \in \mathfrak{u}(n)$.

Proposition 2.1 (p.51 in [Au]). *Let $\mathcal{H}_n = i\mathfrak{u}(n) \subset M_n(\mathbb{C})$ be the set of $(n \times n)$ hermitian matrices with the conjugate $U(n)$-action. Then there is a $U(n)$-equivariant $\mathbb{R}$-vector space isomorphism $\phi : \mathcal{H}_n \to \mathfrak{u}(n)^*$.*

Henceforth, we always think of the co-adjoint action of $U(n)$ on $\mathfrak{u}(n)^*$ as the conjugate $U(n)$-action on $\mathcal{H}_n$. Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n\}$ be a non-increasing sequence of real numbers such that

$$\lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_{n_1} > \lambda_{n_1+1} = \cdots = \lambda_{n_2} > \cdots > \lambda_{n_r+1} = \cdots = \lambda_{n_{r+1}} (= \lambda_n) \tag{2.4}$$

and let $I_\lambda = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{H}_n$ be the diagonal matrix whose (i,i)-th entry is λ_i for $i = 1, \cdots, n$. Then the isotropy subgroup of I_λ is isomorphic to $U(k_1) \times \cdots \times U(k_{r+1})$ and hence the $U(n)$-orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \subset \mathcal{H}_n$ of I_λ is diffeomorphic to $\mathcal{F}(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$. The orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is called the *co-adjoint orbit associated to eigenvalue pattern* λ.

Remark 2.2. Any two similar matrices have the same eigenvalues with the same multiplicities and any hermitian matrix is unitarily diagonalizable. Thus the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is the set of all hermitian matrices having the eigenvalue pattern λ respecting the multiplicities.

2.2. Symplectic structure on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$.

For any compact Lie group G with the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ and for any dual element $\lambda \in \mathfrak{g}^*$, there is a *canonical* G-invariant symplectic form ω_λ, called the *Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form*, on the orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda = G \cdot \lambda$ of the co-adjoint G-action. Furthermore, $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ admits a unique G-invariant Kähler metric compatible with ω_λ and therefore $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ forms a Kähler manifold. We refer the reader to [Br, p.150] for more details.

The Kostant-Kirillov-Souriau symplectic form ω_λ can be described more explicitly in the case where $G = U(n)$ as below. For each $h \in \mathcal{H}_n$, we define a real-valued skew-symmetric bilinear form $\widetilde{\omega}_h$ on $\mathfrak{u}(n) = i\mathcal{H}_n$ by

$$\widetilde{\omega}_h(X, Y) := \mathrm{tr}(ih[X, Y]) = \mathrm{tr}(iY[X, h])$$

for $X, Y \in \mathfrak{u}(n)$. Then the kernel of $\widetilde{\omega}_h$ is given by

$$\ker \widetilde{\omega}_h = \{X \in \mathfrak{u}(n) \mid [X, h] = 0\}.$$

Since $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a homogeneous $U(n)$-space, each tangent space $T_h\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ consists of vectors generated by the $U(n)$-action, i.e.,

$$T_h\mathcal{O}_\lambda = \{[X, h] \in T_h\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}_n \mid X \in \mathfrak{u}(n)\}.$$

Thus $\widetilde{\omega}$ induces a non-degenerate two form ω_λ on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ given by

$$\omega_\lambda([X, h], [Y, h]) = \widetilde{\omega}_h(X, Y)$$

for $h \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ and $X, Y \in \mathfrak{u}(n)$. The closedness of ω_λ follows from the Jacobi identity on $\mathfrak{u}(n)$, see [Au, p.52] for instance.

Note that the diffeomorphism type of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ does not depend on the choice of λ but on $k_\bullet$'s. However, the symplectic form ω_λ depends on the choice of λ. For instance, two co-adjoint orbits $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda'}$ have $k_1 = k_2 = 1$ when $\lambda = \{1, -1\}$ and $\lambda' = \{1, 0\}$ and both orbits are diffeomorphic to $U(2)/(U(1) \times U(1)) \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. However, the symplectic area of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ and $(\mathcal{O}_{\lambda'}, \omega_{\lambda'})$ are one and two, respectively.

Also, any partial flag manifold is a Fano manifold and hence it admits a monotone Kähler form. The following proposition gives a complete description of the monotonicity of ω_λ.

Proposition 2.3 (p.653-654 in [NNU1]). *The symplectic form ω_λ on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ satisfies*

$$c_1(T\mathcal{O}_\lambda) = [\omega_\lambda]$$

if and only if

$$\lambda = (\underbrace{n - n_1, \cdots}_{k_1}, \underbrace{n - n_1 - n_2, \cdots}_{k_2}, \cdots, \underbrace{n - n_{r-1} - n_r, \cdots}_{k_r}, \underbrace{-n_r, \cdots, -n_r}_{k_{r+1}}) + (\underbrace{m, \cdots, m}_{n}),$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{R}$.

2.3. Completely integrable system on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$.

We adorn the co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ with a completely integrable system, called the Gelfand-Cetlin system. We recall a standard definition of a completely integrable system.

Definition 2.4. A *completely integrable system* on a $2n$-dimensional symplectic manifold (M, ω) is a collection of n smooth functions

$$\Phi := \{\Phi_1, \cdots, \Phi_n\} \colon M \to \mathbb{R}^n$$

such that

(1) $\{\Phi_i, \Phi_j\} = 0$ for every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and
(2) $d\Phi_1, \cdots, d\Phi_n$ are linearly independent on an open dense subset of M.

If Φ is a proper map, the Arnold-Liouville theorem states that for any regular value $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of Φ the preimage $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is a Lagrangian torus. However, if $\mathbf{u}$ is a critical value, the fiber might not be a manifold in general.

Here is a weakened version of a completely integrable system, which is more relevant to our situation.

Definition 2.5. A *(continuous) completely integrable system* on a $2n$-dimensional symplectic manifold (M, ω) is a collection of n *continuous* functions

$$\Phi := \{\Phi_1, \cdots, \Phi_n\} \colon M \to \mathbb{R}^n$$

such that there exists an open dense subset $\mathcal{U}$ of M on which

(1) each Φ_i is smooth,
(2) $\{\Phi_i, \Phi_j\} = 0$ for every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, and
(3) $d\Phi_1, \cdots, d\Phi_n$ are linearly independent.

Remark 2.6. Under some technical assumption, Harada and Kaveh [HK] construct a continuous completely integrable system on a smooth projective variety, which is inherited from the moment map of a (singular) toric variety.

For any co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$, Guillemin and Sternberg [GS2] found a completely integrable system (in the sense of Definition 2.5)

$$\Phi_\lambda \colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}^{\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_\lambda},$$

called *the Gelfand-Cetlin system on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ with respect to* the Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form ω_λ. The Gelfand-Cetlin system on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is in general continuous but not smooth. Thus, from now on, a completely integrable system will be meant to be a conitnuous completely integrable system in Definition 2.5 unless mentioned.

We briefly recall a construction of the Gelfand-Cetlin system on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ as follows. (See also [NNU1, p.7-9].) Let $n_\bullet$'s and $k_\bullet$'s be given in (2.1) and (2.2). Let λ be a non-increasing sequence satisfying (2.4). From (2.3), it follows that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{O}_\lambda = 2 \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_\lambda = n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} k_i^2.$$

For $x \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda \subset \mathcal{H}_n$, let $x^{(k)}$ be the $(k \times k)$ principal minor of x for each $k = 1, \cdots, n-1$. Since $x^{(k)}$ is also a hermitian matrix, the eigenvalues are all real. We then define the real-valued function

$$\Phi_\lambda^{i,j} \colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}$$

so that $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}(x)$ is assigned to be the i-th largest eigenvalue of $x^{(i+j-1)}$. Note that the eigenvalues of $x^{(k)}$ are arranged

$$\Phi_\lambda^{1,k}(x) \geq \Phi_\lambda^{2,k-1}(x) \geq \cdots \geq \Phi_\lambda^{k,1}(x)$$

in the descending order. Collecting all $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$'s, we obtain the following system.

Definition 2.7. The *Gelfand-Cetlin system* Φ_λ is defined by the collection of real-valued functions

$$\Phi_\lambda := \left\{ \Phi_\lambda^{i,j} \mid i, j \in \mathbb{N},\ i + j \leq n \right\} : \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}}. \tag{2.5}$$

Remark 2.8. We use the index system (2.5) because it behaves like the Cartesian coordinate system in a ladder diagram (3.1). Notice that our index system is different from the index system in [NNU1].

We consider the coordinate system of $\mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2}$ indexed by (i, j)'s

$$\left\{ (u_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2} \mid i, j \in \mathbb{N}, i + j \leq n \right\} \tag{2.6}$$

so that the component $u_{i,j}$ records the values of $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$. By the min-max principle, the components $u_{i,j}$'s that come from a hermitian matrix $x \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ satisfy the following pattern:

(2.7)



By our assumption (2.4) , we have $\lambda_{n_{i-1}+1} = \cdots = \lambda_{n_i}$ for every $i = 1, \cdots, r+1$. Then it is an immediate consequence of (2.7) that for all $j = n_{i-1}+1, \cdots, n_i - 1$ and each $k = j, \cdots, n_i - 1$,

$$\Phi_\lambda^{j,n-k}(x) = \lambda_{n_i}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$. Thus, there are $\frac{1}{2}(n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} k_i^2)$ non-constant functions among $\{\Phi_\lambda^{j,k}\}_{j,k}$ on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. Let

$$\mathcal{I}_\lambda := \{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2 \mid \Phi_\lambda^{i,j} \text{ is } \textit{not} \text{ a constant function.}\} \tag{2.8}$$

By collecting the non-constant components, we define

$$\Phi_\lambda = \left\{\Phi_\lambda^{i,j} \mid (i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_\lambda\right\} : \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}_\lambda|} \tag{2.9}$$

where $|\mathcal{I}_\lambda| = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathcal{O}_\lambda = n^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} k_i^2$. By abuse of notation, the collection is still denoted by Φ_λ. Guillemin and Sternberg [GS2] prove that Φ_λ satisfies all properties given in Definition 2.5, and hence it is a completely integrable system on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ [5]. We also call the system (2.9) the *Gelfand-Cetlin system associated to* λ. We will not distinguish two notations (2.5) and (2.9) unless any confusion arises.

Definition 2.9. The *Gelfand-Cetlin polytope*[6] $\triangle_\lambda$ is the collection of points $(u_{i,j})$ satisfying (2.7).

Proposition 2.10 ([GS2])**.** *The Gelfand-Cetlin polytope* $\triangle_\lambda$ *coincides with the image of* $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ *under the system* Φ_λ.

Proposition 2.11 (p.113 in [GS2])**.** *The Gelfand-Cetlin system* Φ_λ *is smooth on the open dense subset* $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda)$ *of* $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ *where* $\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda$ *is the interior of* $\triangle_\lambda$.

2.4. **Smoothness of Φ_λ.** Let λ be given in (2.4) and let Φ_λ be the Gelfand-Cetlin system on $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ in (2.5). In general, Φ_λ is *not* smooth on the whole $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. However, the following proposition due to Guillemin-Sternberg states that Φ_λ is smooth on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ *almost everywhere*.

Proposition 2.12 (Proposition 5.3, p.113, and p.122 in [GS2])**.** *For each* $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ *with* $2 \le i+j \le n$*, the component* $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ *is smooth at* $z \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ *if*

$$\Phi_\lambda^{i+1,j}(z) < \Phi_\lambda^{i,j}(z) < \Phi_\lambda^{i,j+1}(z). \tag{2.10}$$

In particular, Φ_λ *is smooth on the open dense subset* $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda)$ *of* $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$*. Furthermore,* $d\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}(z) \neq 0$ *for every point* z *satisfying* (2.10)*.*

One important remark is that a Hamiltonian trajectory of each $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ passing through a point $z \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ satisfying (2.10) is periodic with integer period. Therefore, each $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ generates a Hamiltonian circle action on an open subset of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ on which $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ is smooth. See [GS2, Theorem 3.4 and Section 5] for more details.

[5] In general, the Gelfand-Cetlin system is never smooth on the whole space $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ unless $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a projective space.

[6] It is straightforward to see that $\triangle_\lambda$ is a convex polytope, since $\triangle_\lambda$ is the intersection of half-spaces defined by inequalities in (2.7).

3. Ladder diagram and its face structure

In order to visualize a Gelfand-Cetlin polytope, it is convenient to employ an alternative description of its face structure in terms of certain graphs in the ladder diagram provided by the first named author with An and Kim in [ACK]. The goal of this section is to review their description of Gelfand-Cetlin polytopes.

We begin by the definition of a ladder diagram. Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n\}$ be given in (2.4). Then λ uniquely determines $n_\bullet$'s and $k_\bullet$'s in (2.1) and (2.2).

Definition 3.1 ([BCKV], [NNU1]). Let $\Gamma_{\mathbb{Z}^2} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ be the square grid graph satisfying

(1) its vertex set is $\mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ and
(2) each vertex $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ connects to exactly four vertices $(a, b \pm 1)$ and $(a \pm 1, b)$.

The *ladder diagram* $\Gamma(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ is defined as the induced subgraph of $\Gamma_{\mathbb{Z}^2}$ that is formed from the set $V_{\Gamma(n_1,\cdots,n_r;n)}$ of vertices given by

$$V_{\Gamma(n_1,\cdots,n_r;n)} := \bigcup_{j=0}^{r} \left\{(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \;\middle|\; (a, b) \in [n_j, n_{j+1}] \times [0, n - n_{j+1}]\right\}.$$

As λ determines $n_\bullet$'s, we may simply denote $\Gamma(n_1, \cdots, n_r; n)$ by Γ_λ. We call Γ_λ the *ladder diagram associated to* λ.



$\Gamma(1, 2, 3)$ $\Gamma(2, 3, 5)$

FIGURE 5. Ladder diagrams $\Gamma(1, 2; 3)$ and $\Gamma(2, 3; 5)$.

We call the vertex of Γ_λ located at $(0, 0)$ *the origin*. Also, we call $v \in V_\Gamma$ a *top vertex* if v is a farthest vertex from the origin. Equivalently, a vertex $v = (a, b) \in V_\Gamma$ is a top vertex if $a + b = n$.



FIGURE 6. Top vertices for $\Gamma(1, 2, 3, 4; 5)$ and $\Gamma(2, 4; 6)$.

Definition 3.2 (Definition 2.2 in [BCKV]). A *positive path* on a ladder diagram Γ_λ is a shortest path from the origin to some top vertex in Γ_λ.

Now, we define the face structure of Γ_λ as follows.

Definition 3.3 (Definition 1.5 in [ACK]). Let Γ_λ be a ladder diagram.

- A subgraph γ of Γ_λ is called a *face* of Γ_λ if
  (1) γ contains all top vertices of Γ_λ,
  (2) γ can be represented by the union of positive paths.
- For two faces γ and γ', γ is said to be a *face* of γ' if $\gamma \subset \gamma'$.

- The *dimension* of a face γ is defined by

$$\dim \gamma := \operatorname{rank}_{\mathbb{Z}} H_1(\gamma; \mathbb{Z}),$$

regarding γ as a 1-dimensional CW-complex. In other words, $\dim \gamma$ is the number of minimal cycles in γ.

It is straightforward from Definition 3.3 that for any two faces γ and γ' of Γ_λ, $\gamma \cup \gamma'$ is also a face of Γ_λ, which is the smallest face containing γ and γ'.

We now characterize the face structure of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ in terms of the face structure of the ladder diagram Γ_λ.

Theorem 3.4 (Theorem 1.9 in [ACK]). *For a sequence λ in (2.4), let Γ_λ be the ladder diagram and $\triangle_\lambda$ the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope. Then there exists a bijective map*

$$\{\textit{faces of } \Gamma_\lambda\} \xrightarrow{\Psi} \{\textit{faces of } \triangle_\lambda\}$$

such that for faces γ and γ' of Γ_λ

- $\dim \Psi(\gamma) = \dim \gamma$
- $\gamma \subset \gamma'$ *if and only if* $\Psi(\gamma) \subset \Psi(\gamma')$.

Example 3.5. Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3\}$ with $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3$. The co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ is diffeomorphic to the complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(3)$. Let Γ_λ be the ladder diagram associated to λ as in Figure 7. Here, the blue dots are top vertices and the purple dot is the origin of Γ_λ.

FIGURE 7. Ladder diagram Γ_λ.

The zero, one, two, and three-dimensional faces of Γ_λ are respectively listed in Figure 8, 9, 10, and 11. Here, v_i denotes a vertex for $i \in \{1, \cdots, 7\}$, e_{ij} is the edge containing v_i and v_j, f_I is the facet containing all v_i's for $i \in I$, and $I_{1234567}$ is the three dimensional face, i.e., the whole Γ_λ.



FIGURE 8. The zero-dimensional faces of Γ_λ.



FIGURE 9. The one-dimensional faces of Γ_λ.



FIGURE 10. The two-dimensional faces of Γ_λ.



FIGURE 11. The three-dimensional face of Γ_λ.

The image of the Gelfand-Cetlin system for $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is given in Figure 12. (See Figure 5 in [Ko] or Figure 4 in [NNU1].) We can easily see that the correspondence $\Psi(v_i) = w_i$ of vertices naturally extends to the set of faces of Γ_λ, satisfying (1) and (2) in Theorem 3.4.



FIGURE 12. The Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$.

For our convenience, we describe each point in $\triangle_\lambda$ by using a ladder diagram Γ_λ *with a filling*, putting each component $u_{i,j}$ of the coordinate system (2.6) into the unit box whose top-right vertex is (i, j) of Γ_λ. The Gelfand-Cetlin pattern (2.7) implies that $u_{i,j}$'s is

$$\begin{cases} (1)\ \textit{increasing} \text{ along the columns of } \Gamma_\lambda\ , \textit{and} \\ (2)\ \textit{decreasing} \text{ along the rows of } \Gamma_\lambda \end{cases} \tag{3.1}$$

allowing repetitions (cf. a Young tableau in [Ful]).

Example 3.6. Let $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \simeq \mathcal{F}(3)$ be the co-adjoint orbit from Example 3.5 where $\lambda = \{\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3\}$. Recall that the pattern (2.7) consists of the following inequalities:

$$u_{1,2} \geq u_{1,1},\ \ u_{1,1} \geq u_{2,1},\ \ \lambda_1 \geq u_{1,2},\ \ u_{1,2} \geq \lambda_2,\ \ \lambda_2 \geq u_{2,1},\ \ u_{2,1} \geq \lambda_3.$$

The ladder diagram Γ_λ with a filling by variables $u_{i,j}$'s is as in Figure 13.



FIGURE 13. The ladder diagram Γ_λ with $u_{i,j}$'s variables.

Now, we explain how the map Ψ in Theorem 3.4 is in general defined. For a given face γ of Γ_λ, consider γ with a filling by the coordinate system $\{u_{i,j}\}$. The image of γ under Ψ is the intersection of facets supported by the hyperplanes that are given by equating two adjacent variables $u_{i,j}$'s *not* divided by any positive paths.

Example 3.7. Suppose that $\lambda = \{4, 4, 3, 2, 1\}$ and let γ be a face given as in Figure 14. Then, the corresponding face $\Psi(\gamma)$ in $\triangle_\lambda$ is defined by

$$\Psi(\gamma) = \triangle_\lambda \cap \{u_{2,1} = u_{1,1}\} \cap \{u_{1,1} = u_{1,2}\} \cap \{u_{2,2} = u_{1,2}\} \cap \{u_{2,1} = u_{2,2}\} \cap \{u_{2,2} = u_{2,3}\} \cap \{u_{3,1} = 4\}.$$



FIGURE 14. The bijection Ψ

4. CLASSIFICATION OF LAGRANGIAN FIBERS

Our first main theorem A, which will be proven in Section 5, states that every fiber of the Gelfand-Cetlin system Φ_λ on a co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ is an isotropic submanifold and is realized as the total space of certain iterated bundle

$$E_{n-1} \xrightarrow{p_{n-1}} E_{n-2} \xrightarrow{p_{n-2}} \cdots \xrightarrow{p_2} E_1 \xrightarrow{p_1} E_0 = \text{point} \tag{4.1}$$

such that the fiber at each stage is either a point or a product of odd dimensional spheres. In this section, we provide a combinatorial way how to determine the fiber of each p_i from the ladder diagram (Theorem 4.12). Furthermore, we classify all positions of Lagrangian fibers in the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope (Corollary 4.23).

To address a contrast to the toric case, we consider a $2n$-dimensional compact symplectic toric manifold, which comes with a moment map

$$\Phi\colon M \to \mathbb{R}^n.$$

It is a smooth completely integrable system on M in the sense of Definition 2.4. Atiyah-Guillemin-Sternberg convexity theorem [At, GS1] yields that the image $\triangle := \Phi(M)$ is an n-dimensional convex polytope. Let f be a k-dimensional face of $\triangle$ and let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{f}$ be a point lying on the relative interior $\mathring{f}$ of f. Then $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is a k-dimensional isotropic torus in (M, ω). Consequently, a fiber $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is Lagrangian if and only if $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{\triangle}$. .

In the Gelfand-Cetlin system, however, the preimage of a point in the inteior of a k-th dimensional face of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda = \Phi_\lambda(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$ might have the dimension greater than k. In particular, Φ_λ might admit a Lagrangian fiber over a point not contained in the interior of $\triangle_\lambda$.

Definition 4.1. We call a face f of $\triangle_\lambda$ *Lagrangian* if it contains a point $\mathbf{u}$ in its relative interior $\mathring{f}$ such that the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is Lagrangian. Also, we call a face γ of Γ_λ *Lagrangian* if the corresponding face $f_\gamma := \Psi(\gamma)$ of $\triangle_\lambda$ is Lagrangian where Ψ is given in Theorem 3.4.

Remark 4.2. The fiber over each interior point is Lagrangian once the fiber over one single point in the relative interior $\mathring{f}$ of a face f is Lagrangian. (See Corollary 4.23)

The simplest example of such a Lagrangian face is as follows.

Example 4.3 ([Ko, NNU1])**.** For a complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(3) \simeq \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ of complex dimension three from Example 3.5, we consider the vertex w_3 in Figure 12. Then $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(w_3)$ is a Lagrangian submanifold diffeomorphic to S^3.

From now on, we tacitly identify faces in the ladder diagram Γ_λ with faces in the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ via the map Ψ in Theorem 3.4. For example, "a point r in a face γ" of Γ_λ means a point r lying on the face $\Psi(\gamma) = f_\gamma$ of $\triangle_\lambda$.

4.1. W-shaped blocks and M-shaped blocks.

For each $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, let $\square^{(a,b)}$ be the simple closed region bounded by the unit square in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that the vertices are lying on the lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$ and the top-right vertex is located at (a, b). The region $\square^{(a,b)}$ is simply said to be the *box* at (a, b).

Definition 4.4. For each positive integer $k \geq 1$, a *k-th W-shaped block* denoted by W_k, or simply *a W_k-block*, is defined as

$$W_k := \bigcup_{(a,b)} \square^{(a,b)}$$

where the union is taken over all (a, b)'s in $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1})^2$ such that $k + 1 \leq a + b \leq k + 2$.

A lattice point closest from the origin in the W_k-block is called a *bottom vertex*.

The following figures illustrate W_1, W_2, and W_3 where the red dots in each figure indicate the vertices over which the union is taken in Definition 4.4. Here, the purple dots are bottom vertices.



FIGURE 15. W-shaped blocks

For a given diagram Γ_λ, the set of edges of each face γ divides W_k into several pieces of simple closed regions.

Definition 4.5. Let W_k be a given W-shaped block. We denote by $W_k(\gamma)$ the block W_k with 'walls' coming from edges of γ in it.

Example 4.6. For a sequence λ from Example 3.5, we consider v_3 in Figure 8. There are no edges of v_3 inside W_1 and hence $W_1(v_3) = W_1$ with no walls. The W_2-block is divided by v_3 into three pieces of simple closed regions so that $W_2(v_3)$ is W_2 with two walls (red line segments in Figure 16).



FIGURE 16. $W_i(v_3)$-blocks

Next, we introduce the notion of *M-shaped blocks*.

Definition 4.7. For each positive integer $k \geq 1$, a *k-th M-shaped block* denoted by M_k, or simply an *M_k-block*, is defined, *up to translation in* $\mathbb{R}^2$, as

$$M_k := \bigcup_{(a,b)} \square^{(a,b)}$$

where the union is taken over all (a, b)'s in $(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1})^2$ such that

- $k+1 \leq a+b \leq k+2$,
- $(a,b) \neq (k+1,1)$, and
- $(a,b) \neq (1,k+1)$.



FIGURE 17. M-shaped blocks.

Remark 4.8. Note that M_k can be obtained from W_k by deleting two boxes $\square^{(k+1,1)}$ and $\square^{(1,k+1)}$. The reader should keep in mind that each W-shaped block W_k is located at the specific position, but M_k is not since it is defined up to translation in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

For each divided simple closed region $\mathcal{D}$ in $W_k(\gamma)$, we assign a topological space $S_k(\mathcal{D})$ as follows :

- $S_k(\mathcal{D}) = S^{2\ell-1}$ if $\mathcal{D} = M_\ell$ and $\mathcal{D}$ contains a bottom vertex of the W_k-block, and
- $S_k(\mathcal{D}) = \text{point}$ otherwise.

We then put

$$S_k(\gamma) := \prod_{\mathcal{D} \subset W_k(\gamma)} S_k(\mathcal{D}) \tag{4.2}$$

where the product is taken over all simple closed regions in $W_k(\gamma)$ distinguished by walls coming from edges of γ.

Example 4.9. Again, we consider v_3 in Example 4.6. Note that $S_1(v_3) = \text{pt}$ since $W_1(v_3)$ consists of one simple closed region W_1 which is not an M-shaped block. $W_2(v_3)$ consists of three simple closed regions $\mathcal{D}_1$, $\mathcal{D}_2$, and $\mathcal{D}_3$ as in the figure below. Even if they are M_1-blocks, $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_3$ do not contain any bottom vertices so that $S_2(\mathcal{D}_1) = \text{point}$ and $S_2(\mathcal{D}_3) = \text{point}$. Observe that $\mathcal{D}_2$ is an M_2-block containing a bottom vertex of W_2. Therefore, we have

$$S_2(v_3) = S_2(\mathcal{D}_1) \times S_2(\mathcal{D}_2) \times S_2(\mathcal{D}_3) \cong S^3.$$

For $k > 2$, $W_k(v_3)$ has no walls and hence $W_k(v_3)$ consists of one simple closed region W_k which is not an M-shaped block. Thus $S_k(v_3) = \text{point}$ for every positive integer $k > 2$.



$W_2(v_3)$

Example 4.10. Let $\lambda = \{t,t,0,0\}$ with $t > 0$. Then, the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a complex Grassmannian $\text{Gr}(2,4)$. Let γ be the one-dimensional face of Γ_λ given by



$W_1(\gamma)$ consists of one simple closed region W_1 that is not an M-shaped block. Thus we have $S_1(\gamma) = \text{pt}$.



$W_1(\gamma)$

$W_2(\gamma)$ has two walls (red line segments in the figure below) and is exactly the same as $W_2(v_3)$ in Example 4.9. Thus we have $S_2(\gamma) = S^3$.



$W_2(\gamma)$

$W_3(\gamma)$ has two walls (red line segments in the figure below) so that it consists of three simple closed regions $\mathcal{D}_1$, $\mathcal{D}_2$, and $\mathcal{D}_3$.



$W_3(\gamma)$

Since $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_3$ are not M-shaped blocks, we have $S_3(\mathcal{D}_1) = S_3(\mathcal{D}_3) = \text{point}$. Since $\mathcal{D}_2 = M_1$ and contains a botton vertex of W_3, we have $S_3(\mathcal{D}_2) = S^1$. Therefore,

$$S_3(\gamma) = S_3(\mathcal{D}_1) \times S_3(\mathcal{D}_2) \times S_3(\mathcal{D}_3) \cong S^1.$$

For $k > 3$, $W_k(\gamma)$ consists only one simple closed region which is not an M-shaped block. Thus $S_k(\gamma) = \text{pt}$ for $k > 3$.

Proposition 4.11. *For a non-increasing sequence $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n\}$ of real numbers satisfying (2.4), let γ be a face of the ladder diagram Γ_λ. For each $i \geq 1$, let m_i be the number of simple closed regions $\mathcal{D}$ in $W_i(\gamma)$ such that $S_i(\mathcal{D}) = S^1$. Then we have*

$$\dim \gamma = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} m_i.$$

Proof. Note that $\dim \gamma$ is the number of minimal cycles in γ by Definition 3.3. Also, each minimal cycle σ in γ can be represented by the union of two shortest paths connecting the bottom-left vertex and the top-right vertex of σ. We denote by v_σ the top-right vertex of σ. Then it is straightforward to see that $\square^{v_\sigma}$ (blue-colored region in Figure 18) is contained in the simple closed region bounded by σ. Therefore, if we denote by $\Sigma := \{\sigma_1, \cdots, \sigma_m\}$ the set of minimal cycles in γ, then there is a one-to-one correspondence between Σ and $\{v_{\sigma_i}\}_{1 \leq i \leq m}$.

On the other hand, note that $\square^{v_\sigma}$ is appeared as an M_1-block in $W_i(\gamma)$ where

$$i + 1 = a + b, \quad v_\sigma = (a, b)$$

for each $\sigma \in \Sigma$. Also, every M_1-block appeared in $W_i(\gamma)$ for some i should be one of such $\square^{v_\sigma}$'s. Consequently, there is a one-to-one correspondence between Σ and M_1-blocks appeared in $W_i(\gamma)$ for $i \geq 1$. Observe that $W_i(\gamma)$ does not contain any M_1-blocks for any $i \geq n$. Since $|\Sigma| = \dim \gamma$ by definition, it completes the proof. $\square$



FIGURE 18. Correspondence between minimal cycles and M_1-blocks

Now, we state our main theorem which gives a characterization of each fiber of the Gelfand-Cetlin system.

Theorem 4.12. *Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n\}$ be a non-increasing sequence of real numbers satisfying (2.4). Let γ be a face of Γ_λ and $f_\gamma = \Psi(\gamma)$ be the corresponding face of $\triangle_\lambda$ described in Theorem 3.4. For any point $\mathbf{u}$ in the interior of f_γ, the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is an isotropic submanifold of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ and the total space of an iterated bundle*

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong \overline{S_{n-1}}(\gamma) \xrightarrow{p_{n-1}} \overline{S_{n-2}}(\gamma) \to \cdots \xrightarrow{p_2} \overline{S_1}(\gamma) \xrightarrow{p_1} \overline{S_0}(\gamma) := \text{point} \tag{4.3}$$

where $p_k : \overline{S_k}(\gamma) \to \overline{S_{k-1}}(\gamma)$ is an $S_k(\gamma)$-bundle over $\overline{S_{k-1}}(\gamma)$ for $k = 1, \cdots, n-1$. In particular, the dimension of $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is

$$\dim \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \dim S_k(\gamma).$$

We will give the proof of Theorem 4.12 in Section 5. Now, we illustrate the above theorem by several examples.

Example 4.13. Let λ be given in Example 3.5. Then the complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(3)$ is represented by the coadjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. By using Theorem 4.12, we compute the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(v_i)$ of each vertex v_i for $i = 1, \cdots, 7$ in Figure 8.



FIGURE 19. $W_1(v_i)$'s and $W_2(v_i)$'s for $\mathcal{F}(3)$

Figure 19 shows that $S_1(v_i) = \text{pt}$ for every $i = 1, \cdots, 7$ since in each $W_1(v_i)$, there are no M-shaped blocks containing a bottom vertex, i.e., the origin $(0, 0)$. Also, we can easily check that $S_2(v_i) = \text{point}$ unless $i = 3$. When $i = 3$, there is one M-shaped block M_2 inside $W_2(v_3)$ containing a bottom vertex. Thus we have

$S_2(v_3) = \text{point} \times S^3 \times \text{point} \cong S^3$. Since $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(v_i)$ is an $S_2(v_i)$-bundle over $S_1(v_i)$ and $S_1(v_i)$ is a point for every $i = 1, \cdots, 7$, by Theorem 4.12, we obtain

- $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(v_i) = \text{point}$ for $i \neq 3$, and
- $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(v_3) \cong S^3$.

Example 4.14. Under the same sequence λ given in Example 4.13, we compute the fibers over the points lying on the relative interior of some higher dimensional face of $\triangle_\lambda$ as follows.

Let us first consider the following which is the case of $e = e_{12}$ in Figure 9.



By Theorem 4.12, $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is an $S_2(e_{12})$-bundle over $S_1(e_{12})$ so that it is diffeomorphic to S^1 for every $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{e}_{12}$. For any other edge e of Γ_λ, we can show that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong S^1$ for every point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{e}$ in a similar way. We leave it to the reader as an exercise.

For each two-dimensional face of Γ_λ, let us first consider the face f_{1345} of $\triangle_\lambda$ described in Figure 10. Then we have the following :



Therefore, we have $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong T^2$, an $S_2(f_{1345})$-bundle over $S_1(f_{1345})$, for every point $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{f}_{1345}$. Similarly, we obtain $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong T^2$ for every interior point $\mathbf{u}$ of any two-dimensional face of $\triangle_\lambda$.

By the similar way, we can prove that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is an $S^1 \times S^1$-bundle over S^1 for every interior point $\mathbf{u}$ of Γ_λ. In fact, the Arnold-Liouville theorem implies that the bundle is trivial, i.e., $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is a torus T^3 for every $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{\triangle}_\lambda$, see also Theorem 6.8.



Consequently, a Lagrangian fiber of the Gelfand-Cetlin system on $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ is diffeomorphic to either T^3 (a fiber over an interior point of $\triangle_\lambda$, or S^3 (a fiber over v_3). Other fibers are isotropic but not Lagrangian submanifolds of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ for dimensional reasons.

Remark 4.15. In general, one must *not* expect that every iterated bundle in (4.3) is trivial. Namely, $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ might not be homeomorphic to the product $\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} S_k(\gamma)$. For instance, consider the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \simeq \mathcal{F}(2,3;5)$ associated to $\lambda = (3,3,0,-3,-3)$ as in Figure 20. By Theorem 4.12, the Gelfand-Cetlin fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{0})$ over the origin is an S^3-bundle over S^5. Meanwhile, Proposition 2.7 in [NU2] implies that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{0})$ is $SU(3)$. It is however well-known that $SU(3)$ is not homeomorphic to $S^5 \times S^3$.



$SU(3)$-fiber

FIGURE 20. $SU(3)$-fiber

4.2. **Classification of Lagrangian faces.**

This section is devoted to introduce a more convenient way to determine whether a given face of Γ_λ is Lagrangian or not. By Theorem 4.12, a face γ is Lagrangian if the fiber over an interior point of γ is of dimension $\frac{1}{2}\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{O}_\lambda$

Thus it is sufficient to classify all faces γ's such that

$$\dim \gamma = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \dim S_k(\gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{O}_\lambda.$$

Definition 4.16. For each positive integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and every lattice point $(p,q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, *a k-th L-shaped block $L_k(p,q)$ at (p,q)* , or simply *a L_k-block at (p,q)*, is the closed region

$$L_k(p,q) := \bigcup_{(a,b)} \square^{(a,b)}$$

where the union is taken over all (a,b)'s in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that

- $(a,b) = (p, q+i)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, and
- $(a,b) = (p+i, q)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k-1$.



FIGURE 21. L-shaped blocks

Remark 4.17. We would like to mention that Gelfand-Cetlin patterns are linearly ordered on any of W-shaped, M-shaped and L-shaped blocks in the direction from the right or bottom most block to the left or top most block.

Definition 4.18. Let γ be a face of Γ_λ. For a given positive integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and a lattice point $(a,b) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, we say that $L_k(a,b)$ is *rigid in* γ if

(1) the interior of $L_k(a,b)$ does not contain an edge of γ and
(2) the rightmost edge and the top edge of $L_k(a,b)$ should be edges of γ.

Example 4.19. Let us consider $\Gamma = \Gamma(2,5;7)$ and let γ be given as follows.



In this example, there are exactly four rigid L_k-blocks : $L_3(1,1)$, $L_1(4,1)$, $L_1(5,1)$, and $L_1(5,2)$.



We can check that any other L-blocks are *not* rigid. For instance, $L_3(2,1)$ is not rigid since its interior contains an edge of γ.



Neither is the block $L_2(2,2)$ because its rightmost edge is *not* an edge of γ violating the condition (2) in Definition 4.18.



The following lemma follows from the min-max property of Gelfand-Cetlin pattern (2.7) or more specifically from (3.1).

Lemma 4.20. *Suppose that $L_k(a,b)$ is rigid in a face γ of Γ_λ. Let $Q_k(a,b)$ be the closed region defined by*

$$Q_k(a,b) := \bigcup_{0\le i,j\le k-1} \square^{(a+i,b+j)},$$

i.e., $Q_k(a,b)$ is a unique $(k\times k)$ square-shaped block containing $L_k(a,b)$. Then there are no edges of γ in the interior of $Q_k(a,b)$.

Proof. If $k = 1$, then $L_1(a,b) = Q_1(a,b)$ has no edges in its interior so that there is nothing to prove. Thus we assume that $k \ge 2$. Suppose that there is an edge $e = [v_0v_1]$ of γ contained in the interior of $Q_k(a,b)$. Then, without loss of generality, we may assume that $v_0 = (a_0,b_0)$ is in the interior of $Q_k(a,b)$ so that $a \le a_0 < a+k-1$ and $b \le b_0 < b+k-1$.

Let δ be a positive path contained in γ passing through v_0. Such δ exists by Definition 3.3. Regarding δ as a shortest path from the origin of Γ_λ to v_0, any vertex $(p,q) \in \delta$ satisfies $p \le a_0$ and $q \le b_0$. Hence δ meets

$L_k(a,b)$ at some point (p_0,q_0) with $p_0 \le a_0$ and $q_0 \le b_0$. However, there is no path in γ joining the origin with $(p,q) \in L_k(a,b)$ by the rigidity condition (1) in Definition 4.18 unless $(p,q) = (a, b+k-1)$ or $(a+k-1, b)$. Thus it leads to a contradiction. □

Lemma 4.21. *If two different L-blocks $L_i(a,b)$ and $L_j(c,d)$ are rigid in the same face γ, then they cannot be overlapped, i.e.,*

$$\mathring{L}_i(a,b) \cap \mathring{L}_j(c,d) = \emptyset$$

where $\mathring{L}_i(a,b)$ and $\mathring{L}_j(c,d)$ denote the interior of $L_i(a,b)$ and $L_j(c,d)$, respectively.

Proof. When $(a,b) = (c,d)$ and $i \neq j$, it is obvious that two L-blocks cannot be simultaneously rigid because one violates (1) in Definition 4.18. Suppose that $(a,b) \neq (c,d)$ and $\mathring{L}_i(a,b) \cap \mathring{L}_j(c,d) \neq \emptyset$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $j \ge i$. Then it is straightforward that either the top edge or the rightmost edge of $L_i(a,b)$ lies on the interior of $Q_j(c,d)$. It leads to a contradiction to Lemma 4.20 since the top edge and the rightmost edge of $L_i(a,b)$ are edges of γ by Definition 4.16.



□

Proposition 4.22. *For a sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ satisfying (2.4), let γ be a face of Γ_λ and let f_γ be the face of $\triangle_\lambda$ corresponding to γ. Let $\mathcal{L}(\gamma)$ be the set of all rigid L-shaped blocks in γ. Then, for every point $\mathbf{u}$ in the relative interior of f_γ*

$$\dim \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{L_k(a,b) \in \mathcal{L}(\gamma)} |L_k(a,b)| = \sum_{L_k(a,b) \in \mathcal{L}(\gamma)} (2k-1)$$

where $|L_k(a,b)|$ is the area of $L_k(a,b)$.

Proof. By Theorem 4.12, it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \dim S_k(\gamma) = \sum_{L_k(a,b) \in \mathcal{L}(\gamma)} |L_k(a,b)|.$$

Recall that

$$S_k(\gamma) = \prod_{\mathcal{D} \subset W_k(\gamma)} S_k(\mathcal{D}),$$

in (4.2).

Let $\mathcal{D}$ be a simple closed region in $W_k(\gamma)$. Suppose that $\mathcal{D}$ contains a bottom vertex of W_k and $\mathcal{D} = M_j(a,b)$ for some $j \ge 1$ where $M_j(a,b)$ denotes the j-th M-shaped block whose top-left vertex is (a,b). Then there are two edges e_1 and e_2 of γ on the boundary of M_j as we see below. By (3.1), there are no edges of γ in the interior of $Q_j(a+1, b-j+1)$. Thus $L_j(a+1, b-j+1)$ is a rigid L_j-block in γ.

Similarly, for each rigid $L_j(a,b)$ in γ for some $(a,b) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\ge 1})^2$, we can find an M_j-block in some $W_k(\gamma)$ so that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the set of rigid L_j-blocks in γ and the set of simple closed regions $\mathcal{D}$ appeared in some $W_k(\gamma)$ such that such that $S_k(\mathcal{D}) = S^{2j-1}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigcup_{j=1} \{\text{rigid } L_j\text{-blocks in } \gamma\} & \Leftrightarrow & \bigcup_{k=1}^{n-1} \bigcup_{j=1} \left\{\mathcal{D} \subset W_k(\gamma) \mid S_k(\mathcal{D}) = S^{2j-1}\right\} \\ L_j(a+1, b-j+1) & \leftrightarrow & M_j(a,b). \end{array}$$

Moreover, we have $|M_j| = |L_j| = \dim S_k(\mathcal{D}) = 2j-1$, and hence it completes the proof. □



The following corollary is derived from Theorem 4.12, Lemma 4.21 and Proposition 4.22.

Corollary 4.23. *Let γ be as in Proposition 4.22. Then the followings are equivalent.*

(1) *For an interior point $\mathbf{u}$ of f_γ, the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda,\omega)$.*
(2) *For each interior point $\mathbf{u}$ of f_γ, the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is a Lagrangian submanifold of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda,\omega)$.*
(3) *The set of rigid L-shaped blocks in γ covers the whole Γ_λ.*

Also, we have the following corollary which follows from Corollary 4.23.

Corollary 4.24. *A Gelfand-Cetlin system $\Phi_\lambda\colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \triangle_\lambda$ on a co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda,\omega_\lambda)$ always possesses a non-torus Lagrangian fiber unless $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a projective space.*

Example 4.25. Let $\lambda=\{t,t,0,0,0,0\}$ with $t>0$. The co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a complex Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(2,6)$ of two planes in $\mathbb{C}^6$ and the corresponding ladder diagram Γ_λ is given as follows.



Observe that any faces of Γ_λ do not admit rigid L_k-blocks of $k>2$. Note that there are three Lagrangian faces γ_1, γ_2 and γ_3 of Γ_λ which have only one rigid L_2-block as follows.

: rigid L_1-block



Finally, there is exactly one Lagrangian face γ_4 which has two rigid L_2-blocks as below.



Thus there are exactly four proper Lagrangian faces $\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\gamma_3$ and γ_4 of Γ_λ.

Example 4.26. Let $\lambda = \{3, 2, 1, 0\}$. The co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(4)$ and the corresponding ladder diagram Γ_λ is as follows.



We can easily see that any face of Γ_λ does not have a rigid L_k-block for $k \geq 3$. There are exactly three Lagrangian faces of Γ_λ containing one rigid L_2-block as follows.



Also, it is not hard to see that there is no Lagrangian face that contains more than one L_2-block. Thus γ_1, γ_2, and γ_3 are the only proper Lagrangian faces of Γ_λ.

5. Iterated bundle structures on Gelfand-Cetlin fibers

In this section, for each point $\mathbf{u}$ in a Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$, we construct the iterated bundle $E_\bullet$ described in Section 4 whose total space is the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Using this construction, we complete the proof of Theorem 4.12 by showing that each $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is an isotropic submanifold of the co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$.

For a fixed integer $k \geq 1$, consider sequences $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1})$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_k)$ of real numbers satisfying

$$a_1 \geq b_1 \geq a_2 \geq b_2 \geq \cdots \geq a_k \geq b_k \geq a_{k+1}. \tag{5.1}$$

Denoting by $\mathcal{H}_\ell$ the set of $(\ell \times \ell)$ hermitian matrices for $\ell \geq 1$ and by $\mathrm{sp}(x)$ the spectrum of x, we set

$$\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{a} = \left\{ x \in \mathcal{H}_{k+1} \,\middle|\, \mathrm{sp}(x) = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}\} \right\}$$

to be the co-adjoint $U(k+1)$-orbit of the diagonal matrix $I_\mathfrak{a} := \mathrm{diag}(a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1})$ in $\mathcal{H}_{k+1} \cong \mathfrak{u}(k+1)^*$. We consider its subspace

$$\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \left\{ x \in \mathcal{H}_{k+1} \,\middle|\, \mathrm{sp}(x) = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}\},\ \mathrm{sp}(x^{(k)}) = \{b_1, \cdots, b_k\} \right\}$$

where $x^{(k)}$ denotes the $(k \times k)$ principal minor submatrix of x. It naturally comes with a map

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \rho_{k+1}\colon & \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) & \to & \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b} \\ & x & \mapsto & x^{(k)} \end{array}$$

from $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ to the co-adjoint $U(k)$-orbit $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b}$ of the diagonal matrix $I_\mathfrak{b}$ in $\mathcal{H}_k \cong \mathfrak{u}(k)^*$.

Let $W_k(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ be the k-th W-shaped block W_k together with walls defined by the equalities of a_i's and b_j's as in Figure 22. By comparing the divided regions by the walls on $W_k(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ with M-shaped blocks as in (4.2), we define a topological space $S_k(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$, which is either a single point or a product space of odd dimensional spheres.



FIGURE 22. $W_k(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$

Example 5.1. (1) For $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3) = (5, 4, 2)$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (b_1, b_2) = (4, 2)$, $W_2(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ is divided by three simply closed regions $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$ and $\mathcal{D}_3$. Since $\mathcal{D}_1$ does not contain any bottom vertices and neither $\mathcal{D}_2$ nor $\mathcal{D}_3$ match with M-shaped blocks, $S_2(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = S_2(\mathcal{D}_1) \times S_2(\mathcal{D}_2) \times S_2(\mathcal{D}_3) \cong$ point.



$W_2(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$

(2) For $\mathfrak{a} = (5, 4, 2)$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (4, 4)$, $W_2(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ is divided by three simply closed regions $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$ and $\mathcal{D}_3$. Observe that $\mathcal{D}_1$ and $\mathcal{D}_3$ do not contain any bottom vertices and $\mathcal{D}_2$ is an M_2-block containing bottom vertices of W_2. Therefore, we have

$$S_2(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) = \text{point} \times S^3 \times \text{point} \cong S^3.$$



$W_2(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$

Proposition 5.2. *With the notations above, $\rho_{k+1}\colon \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is an $S_k(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$-bundle over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$.*

Before starting the proof of Proposition 5.2, as preliminaries, we introduce some notations and prove lemmas. We denote by $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ the set of matrices in $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ whose $(k \times k)$ principal minor is the diagonal matrix $I_{\mathfrak{b}}$. So, a matrix in $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ is of the form

$$Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & & 0 & \overline{z}_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & b_k & \overline{z}_k \\ z_1 & \cdots & z_k & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for $z = (z_1, \cdots, z_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k$. Since $Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z)$ has the eigenvalues $\mathfrak{a} = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}\}$, the $(k+1, k+1)$-entry of $Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z)$ is to be constant

$$z_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i \in \mathbb{R}$$

by computing the trace of $Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z)$. The characteristic polynomial of $Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z)$ is expressed as

$$\det(xI - Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z)) = (x - z_{k+1}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k}(x - b_i) - \sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\frac{|z_j|^2}{x - b_j} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k}(x - b_i)\right) = 0, \tag{5.2}$$

whose zeros are $x = a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}$ by our assumption. By inserting $x = a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}$ into (5.2), we obtain the system of $(k+1)$ equations of real coefficients, which are linear with respect to $(|z_1|^2, \cdots, |z_k|^2) \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0})^k$. We sometimes regard an element $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$ as an element $\mathbb{C}^k$ under the identification $Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z) \mapsto z$. The following lemma implies that the solution space is *never* empty as long as $(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$ obeys (5.1).

Lemma 5.3 (Lemma 3.5 in [NNU1]). *Let $a_1, b_1, \cdots, a_k, b_k$, and a_{k+1} be real numbers satisfying (5.1). Then there exists $z_1, \ldots, z_k \in \mathbb{C}$ and $z_{k+1} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_1 & & 0 & \overline{z}_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & b_k & \overline{z}_k \\ z_1 & \cdots & z_k & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix}$$

has eigenvalues $a_1, \ldots, a_{k+1}$.

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose in addition that $a_1, b_1, \cdots, a_k, b_k$, and a_{k+1} in Lemma 5.3 are all distinct. Then there exist positive numbers $\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_k$ such that*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & & 0 & \overline{z}_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & b_k & \overline{z}_k \\ z_1 & \cdots & z_k & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}) \ : \ (z_1, \cdots, z_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k, \ |z_i|^2 = \delta_i \text{ for } i = 1, \cdots, k \right\}$$

where $z_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i$. In particular, we have $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}) \cong T^k$.

Proof. We first note that if $|z_j|^2 = 0$ for some j, then the equation (5.2) (with respect to x) has a solution $x = b_j$. It implies that $b_j \in \{a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}\}$, which contradicts to our assumption that a_i's and b_j's are all distinct. Thus, it is enough to show existence and uniqueness of a solution $(|z_1|^2, \cdots, |z_k|^2)$ of the system of linear equations in (5.2).

The existence immediately follows from Lemma 5.3. Let

$$\{|z_1|^2 = \delta_1 > 0, \cdots, |z_k|^2 = \delta_k > 0\}$$

be one of solutions of (5.2) so that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$ contains a real k-torus

$$T^k = \{(z_1, \cdots, z_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k \mid |z_i|^2 = \delta_i, \ i = 1, \cdots, k\},$$

which yields that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}) \geq k$. Since (5.2) is a system of non-homogeneous *linear* equations with respect to the variables $|z_1|^2, \cdots, |z_k|^2$, the set

$$\left\{(|z_1|^2, \cdots, |z_k|^2) \mid (z_1, \cdots, z_k) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})\right\}$$

is an affine subspace of $\mathbb{R}^k$. Therefore, $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}) = k$ if and only if the equations (5.2) has a unique solution $(|z_1|^2, \cdots, |z_k|^2) = (\delta_1, \cdots, \delta_k)$. It suffices to show that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}) = k$.

Note that $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$ is an $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$-bundle over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ whose projection map is

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \rho_{k+1}: & \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}) & \to & \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}} \\ & x & \mapsto & x^{(k)}. \end{array}$$

More precisely, for each element $y \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$, there exists a unitary matrix $g_y \in U(k)$ (depending on y) such that

$$g_y y g_y^{-1} = I_{\mathfrak{b}}$$

where $I_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is the diagonal matrix $\mathrm{diag}(b_1, \cdots, b_k)$. Then the preimage $\rho_{k+1}^{-1}(y)$ of y can be identified with $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ via

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \rho_{k+1}^{-1}(y) & \longrightarrow & \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \\ Y = \begin{pmatrix} y & * \\ *^t & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} & \mapsto & \begin{pmatrix} g_y & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot Y \cdot \begin{pmatrix} g_y^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ & & = \begin{pmatrix} g_y \cdot y \cdot g_y^{-1} & g_y \cdot * \\ *^t \cdot g_y^{-1} & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \\ & & = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathfrak{b}} & g_y \cdot * \\ *^t \cdot g_y^{-1} & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

so that $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ is an $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$-bundle over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ via ρ_{k+1}.

Now, we consider a sequence of real numbers $\mathfrak{c} = \{c_1, \cdots, c_{k-1}\}$ such that

$$b_1 > c_1 > \cdots > b_{k-1} > c_{k-1} > b_k.$$

Restricting the fibration ρ_{k+1} to $\mathcal{A}_k(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c})$, we similary have an $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$-bundle over $\mathcal{A}_k(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c})$. Note that its total space is the collection of $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ hermitian matrices such that the spectra, the spectra of the $(k \times k)$ principal minor and the spectra of the $(k-1) \times (k-1)$ principal minor are resepectively $\mathfrak{a}$, $\mathfrak{b}$ and $\mathfrak{c}$.

By a similar way described as above, we see that $\mathcal{A}_k(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c})$ is an $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_k(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c})$-bundle over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ with the projection map $\rho_k \colon \mathcal{A}_k(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}) \to \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ such that $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_k(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}) \geq k-1$. Taking a sequence of real numbers $\mathfrak{d} = \{d_1, \cdots, d_{k-2}\}$ so that

$$c_1 > d_1 > \cdots > c_{k-2} > d_{k-2} > c_{k-1},$$

the restriction of ρ_k to $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d})$ induces an $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_k(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c})$-bundle over $\mathcal{A}_{k-1}(\mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d})$.

Proceeding this procedure inductively, we end up obtaining a tower of bundles such that the total space E is a generic fiber of the Gelfand-Cetlin system of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{a}}$. Namely, E is the preimage of a point lying on the interior of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_{\mathfrak{a}}$. By Proposition 2.12, E is a smooth manifold of dimension

$$\dim_{\mathbb{R}} E = \frac{1}{2} \dim_{\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{a}} = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}.$$

On the other hand, by our construction, the dimension of E is the sum of dimensions of all fibers of ρ_i's for $i = 2, \cdots, k+1$ so that

$$\dim E = \dim \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1} + \dim \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_k + \cdots + \dim \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_2.$$

Since $\dim \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i+1} \geq i$ for each i, we get $\dim \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{i+1} = i$ for every $i = 1, \cdots, k$. Lemma 5.4 is established.

□

Note that Lemma 5.4 deals with the case where $a_j \notin \{b_1, \cdots, b_k\}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, k+1$. Now, let us consider the case where $a_{j+1} \in \{b_1, \cdots, b_k\}$ for some $j \in \{0, 1, \cdots, k\}$. Denoting the multiplicity of a_{j+1} in $\mathfrak{a}$ by ℓ, without loss of generality, we assume that $a_j > a_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} > a_{j+\ell+1}$. Then either $a_{j+1} = b_j$ or $a_{j+1} = b_{j+1}$. For the first case, there are two possible cases:

$$\begin{cases} (1)\ a_j > b_j = a_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} > b_{j+\ell}, \text{ or} \\ (2)\ a_j > b_j = a_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} = b_{j+\ell} > a_{j+\ell+1}. \end{cases} \tag{5.3}$$

For the second case, we have two possible cases too:

$$\begin{cases} (3)\ b_j > a_{j+1} = b_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} = b_{j+\ell} > a_{j+\ell+1}, \text{ or} \\ (4)\ b_j > a_{j+1} = b_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} > b_{j+\ell}, \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

Note that only the case (2) above have more multiplicity of b's than a's, i.e., multiplicity $\ell+1$ and ℓ respectively: The cases (1) and (3) have the same multiplicities of both a and b while in the case (4) a has multiplicity ℓ and b has multiplicity $\ell - 1$.

We start with the first inequality of (5.4).

Lemma 5.5 (case (3) of (5.4))**.** *Suppose that* $b_j > a_{j+1} = b_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} = b_{j+\ell} > a_{j+\ell+1}$. *Then, every solution* $(z_1, \cdots, z_k) \in \mathbb{C}^k$ *of the equation (5.2) satisfies*

$$z_{j+1} = \cdots = z_{j+\ell} = 0.$$

Proof. Observe that each term of the equation (5.2)

$$\det(xI - Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z)) = (x - z_{k+1}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k}(x - b_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\frac{|z_i|^2}{x - b_i} \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{k}(x - b_m)\right) = 0$$

is divisible by $(x - b_{j+1})^{\ell-1}$ by our assumption. In particular, the first term of the equation

$$(x - z_{k+1}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k}(x - b_i)$$

is divisible by $(x - b_{j+1})^{\ell}$. For each $i \notin \{j+1, \cdots, j+\ell\}$, so is

$$\frac{|z_i|^2}{x - b_i} \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{k}(x - b_m)$$

since $b_{j+1} = \cdots = b_{j+\ell}$. Taking

$$g(x) := \det(xI - Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z))/(x - b_{j+1})^{\ell-1},$$

we have $g(b_{j+1}) = g(a_{j+1}) = 0$ because $x = a_{j+1} = b_{j+1}$ is a solution of (5.2) with multiplicity ℓ. It yields

$$\left(|z_{j+1}|^2 + \cdots + |z_{j+\ell}|^2\right) \cdot \prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \notin \{j+1,\cdots,j+\ell\}}}^{k}(b_{j+1} - b_m) = 0.$$

Since

$$\prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m \notin \{j+1,\cdots,j+\ell\}}}^{k}(b_{j+1} - b_m) \neq 0,$$

we deduce that $|z_{j+1}|^2 + \cdots + |z_{j+\ell}|^2 = 0$ and hence $z_{j+1} = \cdots = z_{j+\ell} = 0$. □

Therefore, under the assumption (case (3) in (5.4)) on $\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{b}$, the equation (5.2) is written by

$$\begin{aligned}\det(xI - Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z)) &= (x - b_{j+1})^{\ell} \cdot \left\{(x - w_{k+1-\ell}) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k-\ell}(x - b'_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k-\ell}\left(\frac{|w_i|^2}{x - b'_i} \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{k-\ell}(x - b'_m)\right)\right\} \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

where

- $(b'_1 \cdots, b'_{k-\ell}) = (b_1, \cdots, b_j, \widehat{b_{j+1}}, \cdots, \widehat{b_{j+\ell}}, b_{j+\ell+1}, \cdots, b_k)$,
- $(w_1 \cdots, w_{k-\ell}) = (z_1, \cdots, z_j, \widehat{z_{j+1}}, \cdots, \widehat{z_{j+\ell}}, z_{j+\ell+1}, \cdots, z_k)$, and
- $w_{k-\ell+1} = z_{k+1}$.

Observe that the equation

$$\det(xI - Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z))/(x - b_{j+1})^{\ell} = 0$$

is same as the equation $\det(xI - Z_{(\mathfrak{a}',\mathfrak{b}')}(w)) = 0$ where

- $\mathfrak{a}' = (a'_1, \cdots, a'_{k-\ell+1}) = (a_1, \cdots, a_j, \widehat{a_{j+1}}, \cdots, \widehat{a_{j+\ell}}, a_{j+\ell+1}, \cdots, a_{k+1})$ and
- $\mathfrak{b}' = (b'_1, \cdots, b'_{k-\ell})$.

Thus, $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ can be identified with $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1-\ell}(\mathfrak{a}', \mathfrak{b}')$ via

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) & \to & \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1-\ell}(\mathfrak{a}', \mathfrak{b}') \\ (z_1, \cdots, z_j, 0, \cdots, 0, z_{j+\ell+1}, \cdots, z_k) & \mapsto & (z_1, \cdots, z_j, \widehat{z_{j+1}}, \cdots, \widehat{z_{j+\ell}}, z_{j+\ell+1}, \cdots, z_k). \end{array} \tag{5.5}$$

Therefore, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 5.6. *For sequences $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1})$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_k)$ of real numbers obeying (5.1), suppose that there exist $j, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that*

$$b_j > a_{j+1} = b_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} = b_{j+\ell} > a_{j+\ell+1}.$$

Setting $\mathfrak{a}'$ (respectively $\mathfrak{b}'$) to be the sequence of real numbers obtained by deleting $a_{j+1}, \cdots, a_{j+\ell}$ (respectively $b_{j+1}, \cdots, b_{j+\ell}$), $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ can be identified with $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1-\ell}(\mathfrak{a}', \mathfrak{b}')$ under (5.5).

The following two lemmas below are about the cases of (4) in (5.4) and (1) of (5.3). Since they can be proven by using exactly same method of the proof of Lemma 5.5, we omit the proofs.

Lemma 5.7 (case (1) of (5.3))**.** *Suppose that $a_j > b_j = a_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} > b_{j+\ell}$. Then $(z_1, \cdots, z_k) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ if and only if*

- *$z_j = \cdots = z_{j+\ell-1} = 0$, and*
- *$(z_1, \cdots, z_{j-1}, z_{j+\ell}, \cdots, z_k) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k-\ell+1}(\mathfrak{a}', \mathfrak{b}')$*

where $\mathfrak{a}'$ is obtained by deleting $\{a_{j+1}, \cdots, a_{j+\ell}\}$ from $\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{b}' = \{b'_1, \cdots, b'_{k-\ell}\}$ is obtained by deleting $\{b_j, \cdots, b_{j+\ell-1}\}$ from $\mathfrak{b}$.

Lemma 5.8 (case (4) of (5.4))**.** *Suppose that $b_j > a_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} > b_{j+\ell}$. Then $(z_1, \cdots, z_k) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ if and only if*

- *$z_{j+1} = \cdots = z_{j+\ell-1} = 0$, and*
- *$(z_1, \cdots, z_j, z_{j+\ell}, \cdots, z_k) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k-\ell+2}(\mathfrak{a}', \mathfrak{b}')$*

where $\mathfrak{a}' = \{a'_1, \cdots, a'_{k-\ell+2}\}$ is obtained by deleting $\{a_{j+2}, \cdots, a_{j+\ell}\}$ from $\mathfrak{a}$ and $\mathfrak{b}' = \{b'_1, \cdots, b'_{k-\ell+1}\}$ is obtained by deleting $\{b_{j+1}, \cdots, b_{j+\ell-1}\}$ from $\mathfrak{b}$.

It remains to take care of the case (2) of (5.3).

Lemma 5.9 (case (2) of (5.3))**.** *Suppose that*

$$a_j > b_j = a_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} = b_{j+\ell} > a_{j+\ell+1}$$

Then there exists a unique positive real number $C_j > 0$ such that

$$|z_j|^2 + \cdots + |z_{j+\ell}|^2 = C_j.$$

for any $(z_1, \cdots, z_k) \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.5, 5.7, and 5.8, we may reduce $\mathfrak{a} = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}\}$ and $\mathfrak{b} = \{b_1, \cdots, b_k\}$ to

$$\mathfrak{a}' = \{a'_1, \cdots, a'_{r+1}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{b}' = \{b'_1, \cdots, b'_r\}$$

for some $r > 0$ so that there are no subsequences of type (3), (4) of (5.4) or (1) of (5.3) in $(a'_1 \geq b'_1 \geq \cdots \geq a'_r \geq b'_r \geq a'_{r+1})$. Also, the above series of lemmas implies that $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ is identified with $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{r+1}(\mathfrak{a}', \mathfrak{b}')$ under the identification of $w = (w_1, \cdots, w_r)$ with suitable sub-coordinates $(z_{i_1}, \cdots, z_{i_r})$ of $(z_1, \cdots, z_{k+1})$. Therefore, it is enough to prove Lemma 5.9 in the case where $(a_1, b_1, \cdots, a_k, b_k, a_{k+1})$ does not contain any pattern of type (3), (4) of (5.4) or (1) of (5.3).

We temporarily assume that

$$a_j > b_j = a_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} = b_{j+\ell} > a_{j+\ell+1}.$$

is the unique pattern of type (2) of (5.3) in $(a_1, b_1, \cdots, a_k, b_k, a_{k+1})$. Then the equation (5.2) is written as

$$\det(xI - Z) = (x - b_j)^\ell \cdot g(x)$$

where

$$g(x) \quad = \quad (x - z_{k+1}) \prod_{i \notin \{j+1, \cdots, j+\ell\}}^{k} (x - b_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left(\frac{|z_i|^2}{x - b_i} \cdot \prod_{m \notin \{j+1, \cdots, j+\ell\}}^{k} (x - b_m) \right)$$

is a polynomial of degree $(k-\ell+1)$ with respect to x. For the sake of simplicity, we denote by

$$B(x) := \prod_{\substack{m=1 \\ m\notin\{j+1,\cdots,j+\ell\}}}^{k} (x-b_m).$$

Since our assumption says that $\dfrac{1}{x-b_j} = \cdots = \dfrac{1}{x-b_{j+\ell}}$, the second part of $g(x)$ can be written by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\frac{|z_i|^2}{x-b_i}\cdot B(x)\right) = \left(\frac{(|z_j|^2+\cdots+|z_{j+\ell}|^2)}{x-b_j} + \sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i\notin\{j,\cdots,j+\ell\}}}^{k}\frac{|z_i|^2}{x-b_i}\right)\cdot B(x)$$

By substituting $\mathfrak{a}' = \{a'_1\cdots, a'_{k+1-\ell}\}$ and $\mathfrak{b}' = \{b'_1,\cdots,b'_{k-\ell}\}$ where

- $a'_i = a_i$ and $b'_i = b_i$ for $1\le i\le j$,
- $a'_i = a_{i+\ell}$ for $j+1\le i\le k-\ell+1$, and
- $b'_i = b_{i+\ell}$ for $j+1\le i\le k-\ell$,

$\mathfrak{a}'$ and $\mathfrak{b}'$ satisfies

$$a'_1 > b'_1 > \cdots > a'_{k-\ell} > b'_{k-\ell} > a'_{k+1-\ell}.$$

Then we have $g(x) = \det(xI - Z_{(\mathfrak{a}',\mathfrak{b}')}(w))$ where

- $|w_i|^2 = |z_i|^2$ for $1\le i\le j-1$,
- $|w_j|^2 = |z_j|^2+\cdots+|z_{j+\ell}|^2$,
- $|w_i|^2 = |z_{i+\ell}|^2$ for $j+1\le i\le k-\ell$, and
- $w_{k-\ell+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k-\ell+1} a'_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k-\ell} b'_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i = z_{k+1}$.

Thus Lemma 5.4 implies that there exist positive constants $C_1,\cdots,C_{k-\ell}$ such that

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k-\ell+1}(\mathfrak{a}',\mathfrak{b}') = \left\{(w_1,\cdots,w_{k-\ell})\in\mathbb{C}^{k-\ell} \mid |w_j|^2 = C_j,\ j=1,\cdots,k-\ell\right\}.$$

In particular, we have $|w_j|^2 = |z_j|^2+\cdots+|z_{j+\ell}|^2 = C_j$.

It remains to prove the case where $(a_1,b_1,\cdots,a_k,b_k,a_{k+1})$ contains more than one pattern of type (2) of (5.3). However, since all patterns of type (2) of (5.3) are disjoint from one another, we can apply the same argument to each pattern inductively. This completes the proof. □

Now, we are ready to prove Proposition 5.2.

Proof of Proposition 5.2. For a given sequence $a_1\ge b_1\ge\cdots\ge a_k\ge b_k\ge a_{k+1}$, let us consider the W-shaped block $W_k(a,b)$ with walls defined by strict inequalities $a_j > b_j$ or $b_j > a_{j+1}$ for each $j=1,\cdots,k$. (See Figure 22.) Note that each pattern of type (2) in (5.3) corresponds to an M-shaped block inside of $W_k(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$. More specifically, if

$$a_j > b_j = a_{j+1} = \cdots = a_{j+\ell} = b_{j+\ell} > a_{j+\ell+1}.$$

is one of patterns of type (2) in (5.3) for some j, then it corresponds to a simple closed region which is an M-shaped block $M_{\ell+1}$. In particular, we have

$$|M_{\ell+1}| = 2\ell+1 = \dim\left\{(z_j,\cdots,z_{j+\ell})\in\mathbb{C}^{\ell+1} \mid |z_j|^2+\cdots+|z_{j+\ell}|^2 = C_j\right\} = \dim S^{2\ell+1}.$$

for a positive real number C_j. Combining the series of Lemma 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9, we see $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})\cong S_k(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$. Note that $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$ is an $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$-bundle over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ via

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \rho_{k+1}: & \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b}) & \to & \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}} \\ & x & \mapsto & x^{(k)}. \end{array} \tag{5.6}$$

Thus $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$ is an $S_k(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$-bundle over $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$. □

Corollary 5.10. *Let f be a face of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ and γ be the face of the ladder diagram Γ_λ corresponding to f. For any point $\mathbf{u}$ in the interior of f, the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ has an iterated bundle structure given by*

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) = \overline{S_{n-1}}(\gamma) \xrightarrow{p_{n-2}} \overline{S_{n-2}}(\gamma) \to \cdots \xrightarrow{p_1} \overline{S_1}(\gamma) = S_1(\gamma)$$

where $p_{k-1} : \overline{S_k}(\gamma) \to \overline{S_{k-1}}(\gamma)$ is an $S_k(\gamma)$-bundle over $\overline{S_{k-1}}(\gamma)$ for $k = 1, \cdots, n-1$. In particular, $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is of dimension

$$\dim \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \dim S_k(\gamma).$$

Proof. For each $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2_{\geq 1}$, we denote by $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j} \colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ be the component of Φ_λ which corresponds to the unit box $\square^{(i,j)}$ of Γ_λ whose top-right vertex is located at (i,j) in Γ_λ. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>1}$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, let us define

$$a_i(k) := \Phi_\lambda^{i,k+1-i}(\mathbf{u}) \quad \text{and} \quad b_i(k) := a_i(k-1).$$

provided with $a_1(1) := \Phi_\lambda^{1,1}(\mathbf{u})$. Let $\mathfrak{a}(k) := (a_1(k), \cdots, a_k(k))$ and $\mathfrak{b}(k) := (b_1(k), \cdots, b_{k-1}(k))$. By applying Proposition 5.2 repeatedly and observing that $S_k(\gamma) = S_k(\mathfrak{a}(k+1), \mathfrak{b}(k+1))$, we describe the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ as the total space of an iterated bundle as in (5.7). The dimension formula immediately follows. □

(5.7)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\overline{S_{n-1}(\gamma)} & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \iota_{(n-1)}^*\left(\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{a}(n), \mathfrak{b}(n))\right) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{a}(n), \mathfrak{b}(n)) \xhookrightarrow{\iota_{(n)}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{a}(n)} \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle p_{n-1}} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \iota_{(n-1)}^*\rho_n} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho_n} \\
\overline{S_{n-2}(\gamma)} & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{a}(n-1), \mathfrak{b}(n-1)) & \xhookrightarrow{\iota_{(n-1)}} & \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{a}(n-1)} \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle p_{n-2}} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho_{n-1}} & & \\
\vdots & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{a}(n-2)} & & \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\
\overline{S_1(\gamma)} = \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{a}(2), \mathfrak{b}(2)) & \xhookrightarrow{\iota_{(2)}} & \cdots & & & & \\
\downarrow{\scriptstyle p_1 = \rho_2} & & & & & & \\
\overline{S_0(\gamma)} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{a}(1)} & & & & & &
\end{array}$$

To complete the proof of Theorem 4.12, it remains to verify that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is an isotropic submanifold of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ for every $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$. Recall the definition of the Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic from Section 2.2. For a fixed positive integer $k > 1$, let $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1})$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_k)$ be sequences of real numbers satisfying (5.1) and let $\rho_{k+1} \colon \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \to \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b}$ be the map defined by $\rho_{k+1}(x) = x^{(k)}$. Then ρ_{k+1} makes $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ into a $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$-bundle over $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b}$. See Proposition 5.2.

For any $x \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \subset \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathcal{H}_{k+1}$, let $V_x \subset T_x\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ be the vertical tangent space at x with respect to ρ_{k+1} and let H_x be the subspace of $T_x\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ generated by $U(k)$-action where $U(k)$ acts on $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ as a subgroup of $U(k+1)$ via the embedding

$$\begin{array}{rccc} i_k \colon & U(k) & \hookrightarrow & U(k+1) \\ & A & \mapsto & \begin{pmatrix} A & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{array}$$

Then we can see that

$$(\rho_{k+1})_*|_{H_x} \colon H_x \to T_{\rho_{k+1}(x)}\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b}$$

is surjective since ρ_{k+1} is $U(k)$-invariant and the $U(k)$-action on $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is transitive. Let $(i_k)_*\colon \mathfrak{u}(k) \to \mathfrak{u}(k+1)$ be the induced Lie algebra monomorphism. Then the kernel of $\ker(\rho_{k+1})_*|_{H_x}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\ker(\rho_{k+1})_*|_{H_x} &= \left\{[(i_k)_*(X), x] \mid X \in \mathfrak{u}(k),\ [X, x^{(k)}] = 0\right\} \\ &= \left\{[(i_k)_*(X), x] \mid X \in T_e U(k)_{x^{(k)}}\right\}\end{aligned}$$

where $x^{(k)}$ is the $(k \times k)$ principal minor of x and $U(k)_{x^{(k)}}$ is the stabilizer of $x^{(k)} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ for the $U(k)$-action.

From now on, we assume that $U(k)$ acts on $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ via i_k, unless stated otherwise.

Lemma 5.11. *$U(k)$ acts transitively on $\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$.*

Proof. Since any element $x \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ is conjugate to an element of the following form

$$Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & & 0 & \overline{z}_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & b_k & \overline{z}_k \\ z_1 & \cdots & z_k & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \in \widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \subset \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$$

with respect to the $U(k)$-action, it is enough to show that the isotropy subgroup $U(k)_{I_{\mathfrak{b}}}$ of $I_{\mathfrak{b}}$ acts on $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ transitively where $I_{\mathfrak{b}}$ is the diagonal matrix whose (i,i)-th entry is b_i for $i = 1, \cdots, k$.

Now, let us assume that

$$b_{i_0} := b_1 = \cdots = b_{i_1} > b_{i_1+1} = \cdots = b_{i_2} > \cdots > b_{i_{r-1}+1} = \cdots = b_{i_r} := b_k.$$

for some $r \geq 1$ provided with $i_0 = 0$ and $i_r = k$. Then it is not hard to show that $U(k)_{I_b} = U(k_1) \times \cdots \times U(k_r)$ where $k_j = i_j - i_{j-1}$ for $j = 1, \cdots, r$. For each j, we know that each $(z_{i_j+1}, \cdots, z_{i_{j+1}}) \in \mathbb{C}^{k_{j+1}}$ satisfies either

- $|z_{i_j+1}|^2 + \cdots + |z_{i_{j+1}}|^2 = 0$, or
- $|z_{i_j+1}|^2 + \cdots + |z_{i_{j+1}}|^2 = C_{j+1}$ for some positive constant $C_{j+1} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$

by Lemma 5.5, 5.7, 5.8, and 5.9. In the latter case, $U(k)_{I_b}$-action is written as

$$\begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} I_b & \overline{z}^t \\ z & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} g^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_b & g\overline{z}^t \\ zg^{-1} & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix}$$

for every $g \in U(k)_{I_b}$ and $z = (z_1, \cdots, z_k)$. Note that every $g \in U(k)_{I_b}$ is of the form

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} g_1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & g_2 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & g_r \end{pmatrix}$$

where $g_i \in U(k_i)$ for $i = 1, \cdots, r$. Thus each $g \in U(k)_{I_b}$ acts on $(z)_{j+1} := (z_{i_j+1}, \cdots, z_{i_{j+1}}) \in \mathbb{C}^{k_{j+1}}$ by $(z)_{j+1} \cdot g_{j+1}^{-1}$ which is equivalent to the standard linear $U(k_{j+1})$-action on the sphere $S^{2k_{j+1}-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^{k_j}$ of radius $\sqrt{C_{j+1}}$. Therefore, the action is transitive. □

Lemma 5.12. *For each $x \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ and any $\xi, \eta \in T_x\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$, we have*

$$(\omega_{\mathfrak{a}})_x(\xi, \eta) = (\omega_{\mathfrak{b}})_{\rho_{k+1}(x)}((\rho_{k+1})_*\xi, (\rho_{k+1})_*\eta).$$

In particular, the vertical tangent space $V_x \subset T_x\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ of ρ_{k+1} is contained in $\ker(\omega_{\mathfrak{a}})_x$.

Proof. Note that Lemma 5.11 implies that any tangent vector in $T_x\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ can be written as $[(i_k)_*(X), x]$ for some $X \in \mathfrak{u}(k)$ where

$$(i_k)_*(X) = \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{u}(k+1).$$

Thus for any $\xi, \eta \in T_x\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$, there exist $X, Y \in \mathfrak{u}(k)$ such that

$$\xi = [(i_k)_*(X), x], \quad \eta = [(i_k)_*(Y), x].$$

Therefore, we have

$$(\omega_{\mathfrak{a}})_x(\xi,\eta) = \mathrm{tr}(ix[(i_k)_*(X),(i_k)_*(Y)]) = \mathrm{tr}(ix^{(k)}[X,Y]) = (\omega_{\mathfrak{b}})_{x^{(k)}}([X,x^{(k)}],[Y,x^{(k)}])$$

since the $(k+1,k+1)$-th entry of the matrix $x[(i_k)_*(X),(i_k)_*(Y)]$ is zero by direct computation. Since ρ_{k+1} is $U(k)$-invariant, we obtain that $[X,x^{(k)}] = (\rho_{k+1})_*(\xi)$ and $[Y,x^{(k)}] = (\rho_{k+1})_*(\eta)$. This completes the proof. □

Proposition 5.13. *For any* $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$*, the fiber* $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ *is an isotropic submanifold of* $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda,\omega_\lambda)$*, i.e.,* $\omega|_{\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})} = 0$.

Proof. Suppose that γ is a face of Γ_λ such that the corresponding face f_γ contains $\mathbf{u}$ in its interior. Let $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ and let $\xi,\eta \in T_x\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Then Corollary 5.10 says that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is the total space of an iterated bundle

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\gamma) = \overline{S_{n-1}}(\gamma) \xrightarrow{p_{n-2}} \overline{S_{n-2}}(\gamma) \to \cdots \xrightarrow{p_1} \overline{S_1}(\gamma) = S_1(\gamma).$$

described in (5.7).

For each integer k with $1 < k \le n$ and $1 \le i \le k$, let us define

$$a_i(k) := \Phi_\lambda^{i,k+1-i}(\mathbf{u}).$$

provided with $a_1(1) := \Phi_\lambda^{1,1}(\mathbf{u})$ and let $\mathfrak{a}(k) := (a_1(k),\cdots,a_k(k))$. In particular, we have $\mathfrak{a}(n) = \lambda = \{\lambda_1,\cdots,\lambda_n\}$. Then Lemma 5.12 implies that

$$(\omega_{\mathfrak{a}(n)})_x(\xi,\eta) = (\omega_{\mathfrak{a}(n-1)})_{\rho_n(x)}((\rho_n)_*(\xi),(\rho_n)_*(\eta)).$$

Since p_{n-2} is the restriction of ρ_n to $\overline{S}_{n-1}(\gamma) \subset \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{a}(n),\mathfrak{a}(n-1))$, both $(\rho_n)_*(\xi)$ and $(\rho_n)_*(\eta)$ are lying on $T_{\pi_{n-2}(x)}\overline{S}_{n-2}(\gamma) \subset T_{p_{n-2}(x)}\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{a}(n-1),\mathfrak{a}(n-2))$.

Thus we can apply Lemma 5.12 inductively so that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\omega_{\mathfrak{a}(n)})_x(\xi,\eta) &= (\omega_{\mathfrak{a}(n-1)})_{\rho_n(x)}((\rho_n)_*(\xi),(\rho_n)_*(\eta)) \\
&= (\omega_{\mathfrak{a}(n-2)})_{\rho_{n-1}\circ\rho_n(x)}((\rho_{n-1}\circ\rho_n)_*(\xi),(\rho_{n-1}\circ\rho_n)_*(\eta)) \\
&= \cdots \\
&= (\omega_{\mathfrak{a}(2)})_{\rho_2\circ\cdots\circ\rho_n(x)}((\rho_2\circ\cdots\circ\rho_n)_*(\xi),(\rho_2\circ\cdots\circ\rho_n)_*(\eta)) \\
&= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from $\rho_2\colon \mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{a}(2),\mathfrak{a}(1)) \to \{a_1(1) = \Phi_\lambda^{1,1}(\mathbf{u})\} = \mathrm{point}$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.12. It follows from Corollary 5.10 and Proposition 5.13. □

6. Degenerations of fibers to tori

In this section, we study the topology of Gelfand-Cetlin fibers via toric degenerations and describe how each fiber of the Gelfand-Cetlin system degenerates to a toric fiber of a toric moment map. In Section 5, for a point $\mathbf{u}$ on the relative interior of an r-dimensional face, the fiber was expressed in terms of the total space of an iterated bundle

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong \overline{S_{n-1}}(\gamma) \xrightarrow{p_{n-1}} \overline{S_{n-2}}(\gamma) \to \cdots \xrightarrow{p_2} \overline{S_1}(\gamma) \xrightarrow{p_1} \overline{S_0}(\gamma) := \mathrm{point}.$$

The main theorem of this section further claims that the circles appeared in the iterated bundle as fibers can be factored out of $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Namely, letting $\overline{S_i}(\gamma)$ be $(S^1)^{m_i} \times Y_i$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} m_i = r$, the fiber is written as the product

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) = (S^1)^m \times Y(\mathbf{u})$$

where $Y(\mathbf{u})$ is the total space of a certain iterated bundle whose fibers at stages are $Y_\bullet$'s, see Theorem 6.8. Indeed, $Y(\mathbf{u})$ shrinks to a point through a toric degeneration, which illustrates how fibers degenerate into toric fibers. As an application, it provides a more concrete description of the Gelfand-Cetlin fiber. Furthermore, we compute the fundamental group and the second homotopy group of $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$.

Recall that for a given Kähler manifold (X,ω), a flat family $\pi\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{C}$ of algebraic varieties is called a *toric degeneration* (X,ω) if there exists an algebraic embedding $i\colon \mathcal{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}^N \times \mathbb{C}$ such that

(1) the diagram

(6.1)


commutes where $q\colon \mathbb{P}^N \times \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}$ is the projection to the second factor,

(2) $\pi^{-1}(\mathbb{C}^*)$ is isomorphic to $X \times \mathbb{C}^*$ as a complex variety, and

(3) For the product Kähler form $\widetilde{\omega} := \omega_{\mathrm{FS}} \oplus \omega_{\mathrm{std}}$ on $\mathbb{P}^N \times \mathbb{C}$ where ω_{FS} is a multiple of the Fubini-Study form on $\mathbb{P}^N$ and ω_{std} is the standard Kähler form on $\mathbb{C}$,
   - $(X_1, \widetilde{\omega}|_{X_1})$ is symplectomorphic to (X, ω), and
   - X_0 is a projective toric variety (in $\mathbb{P}^N$) and $\widetilde{\omega}|_{X_0}$ is a torus invariant Kähler form denoted by ω_0

   where $X_t := \pi^{-1}(t) \cong i(\pi^{-1}(t)) \subset \mathbb{P}^N \times \{t\}$ is a projective variety for every $t \in \mathbb{C}$.

Let $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{sm}} \subset \mathcal{X}$ be the smooth locus of $\mathcal{X}$. The Hamiltonian vector field for the imaginary part $\mathrm{Im}(\pi)$ of π is defined on $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{sm}}$ and we denote it by $\widetilde{V}_\pi$. By the holomorphicity, π satisfies the Cauchy-Riemann equation which induces $\nabla \mathrm{Re}(\pi) = -\widetilde{V}_\pi$ where ∇ denotes the gradient vector field with respect to a Kähler metric associated to $\widetilde{\omega}$. Define

$$V_\pi := \widetilde{V}_\pi / ||\widetilde{V}_\pi||^2$$

and call it the *gradient-Hamiltonian vector field of* π, see Ruan [Ru]. Then the one-parameter subgroup generated by V_π induces a symplectomorphism

$$\phi\colon (\mathcal{U}, \omega) \to (\phi(\mathcal{U}), \omega_0) \tag{6.2}$$

on an open dense subset $\mathcal{U}$ of X and it is extended to a surjective continuous map

$$\phi\colon X \to X_0$$

defined on the whole X, see Harada-Kaveh [HK, Theorem A] for more details.

Moreover, we may consider a toric degeneration of a Kähler manifold *"equipped with a completely integrable system"* as follows. Let us consider a triple (X, ω, Θ) where Θ is a (continuous) completely integrable system on (X, ω). Then we call $\pi\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{C}$ a *toric degeneration* of (X, ω, Θ) if π is a toric degeneration of (X, ω) and $\Theta = \Phi \circ \phi$ where $\Phi\colon X_0 \to \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ is a moment map on (X_0, ω_0), see [NNU1, Definition 1.1]. Here, $\mathcal{I}$ is a finite index set such that $|\mathcal{I}| = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} X_0$.

Note that the Hamiltonian vector field of each component Φ_α of Φ $(= \{\Phi_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}})$ is globally defined on X_0 even though X_0 might not be smooth by the following reason. Note that $X_0 \subset \mathbb{P}^N \times \{0\}$ is a projective toric variety, which is the Zariski closure of the single orbit of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{|\mathcal{I}|}$-action on X_0. The $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{|\mathcal{I}|}$-action on X_0 extends to the linear Hamiltonian action on $\mathbb{P}^N$. Each component Φ_α of the moment map on X_0 for the action of the maximal compact subgroup $(S^1)^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ is the restriction of the Hamiltonian of the linear Hamiltonian vector field denoted by ξ_α which is defined on $\mathbb{P}^N$. Also, since X_0 is $T^{|\mathcal{I}|}$-invariant, the trajectory of the flow of ξ_α passing through a point in X_0 should be lying on X_0, i.e., the restriction $\xi_\alpha|_{X_0}$ should be tangent[7] to X_0. Therefore, the Hamiltonian vector field of Φ_α is defined on the whole X_0 for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$.

For each $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$, let Θ_α be the corresponding component of the completely integrable system Θ on X. Let $\mathcal{V}_\alpha$ be the open dense subset of X on which Θ_α is smooth. (See Definition 2.5.) Then the Hamiltonian vector field, denoted by ζ_α, of Θ_α is defined on $\mathcal{V}_\alpha$. For any subset $\mathcal{I}' \subset \mathcal{I}$, we set

$$\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'} := \bigcap_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}'} \mathcal{V}_\alpha \tag{6.3}$$

so that the Hamiltonian vector field of Θ_α is defined on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}'$. If Θ_α is a periodic Hamiltonian, i.e., if Θ_α generates a circle action for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}'$, then $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ admits the $T^{|\mathcal{I}'|}$-action generated by $\{\zeta_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \mathcal{I}'}$. Note that $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ is open dense so that $\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ is also open dense where $\mathcal{U}$ is in (6.2).

[7]Every toric variety is a stratified space [LS] so that each point in X_0 is contained in an open smooth stratum and each vector field ξ_α is tangent to the stratum.

Lemma 6.1. *For any $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$,*

$$\phi(\exp(t\,\zeta_\alpha)\cdot p) = \exp(t\,\xi_\alpha)\cdot\phi(p)$$

for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in \mathcal{U}\cap\mathcal{V}_\alpha$.

Proof. Let us fix $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$. From the fact that

- $\phi^*\omega_0 = \omega$ on $\mathcal{U}\cap\mathcal{V}_\alpha$ and
- $\Theta = \Phi\circ\phi$,

we deduce

$$\omega_0(\phi_*(\zeta_\alpha),\phi_*(\cdot)) = \omega(\zeta_\alpha,\cdot) = d\Theta_\alpha(\cdot) = d\Phi_\alpha\circ d\phi(\cdot) = \omega_0(\xi_\alpha,\phi_*(\cdot))$$

so that $\phi_*(\zeta_\alpha) = \xi_\alpha$ on $\mathcal{U}\cap\mathcal{V}_\alpha$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_\alpha(\phi(p)) &= \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0}\exp(t\xi_\alpha)\cdot\phi(p), \quad \text{and}\\ \phi_*(\zeta_\alpha(p)) &= \phi_*\left(\left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0}\exp(t\zeta_\alpha)\cdot p\right)\\ &= \left.\frac{d}{dt}\right|_{t=0}\phi(\exp(t\zeta_\alpha)\cdot p),\end{aligned}$$

for every $p\in\mathcal{U}\cap\mathcal{V}_\alpha$ and this completes the proof by the uniqueness of the solution of ODE. □

Let $\mathcal{I}'\subset\mathcal{I}$ and suppose that Θ_α is a periodic Hamiltonian on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ for every $\alpha\in\mathcal{I}'$. Since Φ_α is a periodic Hamiltonian on X_0 for every $\alpha\in\mathcal{I}$, we obtain the following directly from Lemma 6.1.

Corollary 6.2. *Let $\mathcal{I}'\subset\mathcal{I}$ such that $\{\Theta_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}'}$ are periodic Hamiltonians on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$. Then ϕ is $T^{|\mathcal{I}'|}$-equivariant on $\mathcal{U}\cap\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$.*

Now, let us consider the case of partial flag manifolds. In [NNU1], Nishinou-Nohara-Ueda built a toric degeneration of the Gelfand-Cetlin system $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda,\omega_\lambda,\Phi_\lambda)$ for any eigenvalue pattern λ. We briefly recall the construction of a toric degeneration of $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda,\omega_\lambda,\Phi_\lambda)$ in stages and a continuous map $\phi\colon\mathcal{O}_\lambda\to X_0$ where X_0 denotes the central fiber of the toric degeneration, which is a singular toric variety. (We also refer the reader to [KoM] or [NNU1] for more details.)

For a given (partial) flag manifold $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda,\omega_\lambda)$, Kogan and Miller [KoM] constructed an $(n-1)$-parameter family $F\colon\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ of projective varieties satisfying

$$F = q\circ\iota, \qquad \mathcal{X}\overset{\iota}{\hookrightarrow} P\times\mathbb{C}^{n-1}\overset{q}{\to}\mathbb{C}^{n-1} \tag{6.4}$$

where $P=\prod_{k=1}^r\mathbb{P}_{n_k}$[8]. Furthermore, there exists a Kähler form $\widetilde{\omega}$ on $P\times\mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ such that

- $(F^{-1}(1,\cdots,1),\widetilde{\omega}|_{F^{-1}(1,\cdots,1)})\cong(\mathcal{O}_\lambda,\omega_\lambda)$ and
- $F^{-1}(0,\cdots,0)$ is isomorphic to the Gelfand-Cetlin toric variety X_0 for $\triangle_\lambda$ with the torus-invaraint Kähler form $\widetilde{\omega}|_{F^{-1}(0,\cdots,0)}$ on X_0.

See [NNU1, Section 5 and Remark 5.2] for the case of partial flag manifolds. Following [NNU1], we denote the coordinates of $\mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ by $(t_2,\cdots,t_n)$ and $F^{-1}(1,\cdots,1,t=t_k,0,\cdots,0)$ by $X_{k,t}$ for $k\geq 2$ and $t\in\mathbb{C}$. Then $\{X_{k,t}\}$ can be regarded as a family of projective varieties contained in P where $X_{n,1}\cong\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is the image of the Plücker embedding of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ and $X_{2,0}=X_0$ is a toric variety contained in P.

Let T^k be a k-dimensional compact torus whose i-th coordinate is denoted by $\tau_{i,j}$ for $1\leq i\leq k$ where $i+j-1=k$[9]. Each S^1-action corresponding to $\tau_{i,j}$ extends to the linear Hamiltonian S^1-action on P and we denote the moment map for the action by

$$\Phi^{i,j}: P\to\mathbb{R}. \tag{6.5}$$

[8] $\mathbb{P}_m$ is defined to be $\mathbb{P}(\wedge^m\mathbb{C}^n)=\mathbb{P}^{\binom{n}{m}-1}$. See [NNU1, p. 652].

[9] For the consistency of (2.6), we use the index (i,j).

In addition, the subgroup $U(k)$ of $U(n)$ acts on P where the action is induced from the linear $U(n)$ action on $\mathbb{C}^n$. We denote the moment map for the $U(k)$-action by

$$\mu^{(k)}\colon P \to \mathfrak{u}(k)^*$$

for each $k = 1, \cdots, n$. Setting $k = i + j - 1$ again, we have a map

$$\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}\colon P \to \mathbb{R} \tag{6.6}$$

which assigns the i-th largest eigenvalue of $\mu^{(k)}(p)$. See [NNU1, p. 668].

Remark 6.3. As mentioned in Section 2, we choose the double indices respecting the coordinate system in a ladder diagram. One should translate notations (6.5) and (6.6) into $v_i^{(k)}$'s and $\lambda_i^{(k)}$'s in [NNU1] as follows.

$$\Phi^{i,j} = v_i^{(k)}, \quad \Phi_\lambda^{i,j} = \lambda_i^{(k)}$$

where $i + j = k + 1$.

An important fact is that a fiber of F in (6.4) is invariant neither under the $U(n)$ action nor under the $T^1 \times T^2 \times \cdots \times T^{n-1}$ action on P in general, but a fiber $X_{k,t}$ is invariant under the $U(k-1)$ action and the $T^k \times \cdots \times T^{n-1}$ action for each $k \geq 2$ and $t \in \mathbb{C}$. The following theorem states that the maps $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$'s in (6.6) and $\Phi^{i,j}$'s in (6.5) defined on P induces a completely integrable system on $X_{k,t}$ and how the Gelfand-Cetlin system Φ_λ on $X_{n,1} \cong \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ degenerates into the toric moment map Φ on $X_{2,0} \cong X_0$ *in stages*. See also Section 5 and Section 7 of [NNU1] for more details.

Theorem 6.4 (Theorem 6.1 in [NNU1]). *For every $k \geq 2$ and $t \in \mathbb{C}$, the map*

$$\Phi_{k,t} := (\Phi_\lambda^{1,1}, \cdots, \Phi_\lambda^{k-2,1}, \Phi^{1,k-1}, \cdots, \Phi^{n-2,1})|_{X_{k,t}} : X_{k,t} \to \mathbb{R}^{\dim \triangle_\lambda}$$

is a completely integrable system on $X_{k,t}$ in the sense of Definition 2.5. Moreover, $\Phi_\lambda^{i,k-i} = \Phi^{i,k-i}$ on $X_{k,0}$ for every $i = 1, \cdots, k-1$.

Note that $\Phi_{k,t}$'s are related to one another via the *gradient-Hamiltonian flows*. More precisely, for each $m = 1, \cdots, n-1$, let F_m be the m-th component of F and let $\widetilde{V}_m$ be the Hamiltonian vector field of $\mathrm{Im}(F_m)$ on the smooth locus $\mathcal{X}^{\mathrm{sm}}$ of $\mathcal{X}$. Then the gradient-Hamiltonian vector field is defined by

$$V_m := \widetilde{V}_m / ||\widetilde{V}_m||^2.$$

The flow of V_m, which we denote by $\phi_{m,t}$, preserves the fiberwise symplectic form and so $\phi_{m,t}$ induces a symplectomorphism on an open subset of each fiber on which $\phi_{m,t}$ is smooth. As a corollary, we have the following.

Corollary 6.5 (Corollary 7.3 in [NNU1]). *The gradient-Hamiltonian vector field V_k gives a deformation of $X_{k,t}$ preserving the structure of completely integrable systems. In particular, we have the following commuting diagram for every $t \geq 0$:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_{k,1} & \xrightarrow{\phi_{k,1-t}} & X_{k,t} \\ & {\scriptstyle \Phi_{k,1}} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \Phi_{k,t}} & \\ & \Delta_\lambda & \end{array} \tag{6.7}$$

By Corollary 6.5, we obtain a continuous map

$$\phi\colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda = X_{n,1} \to X_0 = X_{2,0} \tag{6.8}$$

where $\phi = \phi_{2,1} \circ \cdots \circ \phi_{n,1}$ and it satisfies $\Phi \circ \phi = \Phi_\lambda$. Note that

$$\phi\colon \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda) \to \Phi^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda)$$

is a symplectomorphism.

Now, we investigate which component $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ is smooth on a given fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Let γ be an r-dimensional face of Γ_λ and let f_γ be the corresponding face of $\triangle_\lambda$. Let

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)} := \{(i,j) \mid (i,j) = v_\sigma \text{ for some minimal cycle } \sigma \text{ of } \gamma\}$$

so that $|\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}| = r$. (See Figure 18.)

Lemma 6.6. *Each $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ is smooth on $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{f}_\gamma)$ for every $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}$. Furthermore, $\{\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}\}_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}}$ generates a smooth T^r-action on $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ for every $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{f}_\gamma$.*

Proof. The smoothness of each $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ on $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{f}_\gamma)$ follows from the condition $(i,j) = v_\sigma$ and Proposition 2.12. Also, we have seen in Section 2.4 that each $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ generates a smooth circle action on a subset of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ on which $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ is smooth. Since all components of Φ_λ Poisson-commute with each other, it finishes the proof. □

We then obtain the following.

Proposition 6.7. *For each $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{f}_\gamma$, there exists a T^r-equivariant map*

$$\phi_\mathbf{u} \colon \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \to \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong T^r.$$

Furthermore, the T^r-action on $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is free and $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ becomes a trivial principal T^r-bundle over $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})/T^r$.

Proof. For the sake of convenience, let $\mathcal{I}_\lambda = \{(i,j)\}$ be the index set (2.8) which labels the components of Φ_λ and the components of Φ simultaneously. Keeping in mind that Φ_λ^α is smooth on $\mathcal{U} := \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda)$ for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}$ by Proposition 2.12, Corollary 6.2 yields that

$$\phi \colon \mathcal{U} \to \Phi^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda)$$

is $T^{|\mathcal{I}|}$-equivariant with respect to the $T^{|\mathcal{I}|}$-action generated by $\{\Phi_\lambda^\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}}$. Since $T^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ acts freely on $\Phi^{-1}(\mathring{\triangle}_\lambda) \cong (\mathbb{C}^*)^{|\mathcal{I}|}$, $T^{|\mathcal{I}|}$ should also act freely on $\mathcal{U}$ by the equivariance of ϕ.

Now, setting $\mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}$, let $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ be the open subset of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ as defined in (6.3). On $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$, Φ_λ^α is smooth for every $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}'$ so that $T^{|\mathcal{I}'|}$-action (generated by $\{\Phi_\lambda^\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\mathcal{I}'}$) is well-defined. Then we observe the followings :

(1) ϕ is $T^{|\mathcal{I}'|}$-equivariant on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ because every point in $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$ is a limit point of $\mathcal{U}$, ϕ is a continuous map and the $T^{|\mathcal{I}'|}$-equivariance is a closed property.

(2) The $T^{|\mathcal{I}'|}$-action on $\Phi^{-1}(\mathring{f}_\gamma)$ is free since for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{I}'$, we have

$$e_\alpha \cdot v = \pm 1$$

for every primitive normal vector v of the face f_γ where e_α is the unit coordinate vector corresponding to α.

By the equivariance of ϕ together with (1) and (2) above, the $T^{|\mathcal{I}'|}$-action is free on $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}'}$. In particular, the map

$$\phi_\mathbf{u} := \phi|_{\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})} : \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \to \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong T^{|\mathcal{I}'|}$$

becomes a bundle map and hence the bundle $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is trivial as desired. □

To sum up, we can describe as follows how each fiber of the Gelfand-Cetlin system deforms into a torus fiber of a moment map of X_0 via a toric degeneration.

Theorem 6.8. *Let γ be a face of the ladder diagram Γ_λ of dimension r and let f_γ be the corresponding face of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$. For each point $\mathbf{u}$ in the relative interior $\mathring{f}_\gamma$, all S^1-factors that appeared in each stage of the iterated bundle structure $\overline{S_\bullet}(\gamma)$ of $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ given in Theorem 4.12 become trivial factors. That is, $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong T^r \times \overline{S_\bullet}(\gamma)'$ where $\overline{S_\bullet}(\gamma)'$ is the total space of the iterated bundle which can be obtained by the construction of $\overline{S_\bullet}(\gamma)$ ignoring all S^1-factors appeared in each stage. Furthermore, the continuous map ϕ in (6.8) on each fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is the projection map*

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong T^r \times \overline{S_\bullet}(\gamma)' \xrightarrow{\phi} T^r \cong \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}).$$

Proof. Consider the iterated bundle structure of $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ given in Theorem 4.12 :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong \overline{S_{n-1}}(\gamma) & \xrightarrow{p_{n-1}} & \overline{S_{n-2}}(\gamma) & \to & \cdots & \xrightarrow{p_2} & \overline{S_1}(\gamma) & \xrightarrow{p_1} & \overline{S_0}(\gamma) := \text{point} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ S_{n-1}(\gamma) & & S_{n-2}(\gamma) & & \cdots & & S_1(\gamma) & & \end{array} \tag{6.9}$$

where $S_k(\gamma)$ is the fiber of $p_k : \overline{S_k}(\gamma) \to \overline{S_{k-1}}(\gamma)$ at the k-th stage defined in (4.2). Each $S_k(\gamma)$ can be factorized into $S_k(\gamma) = (S^1)^{r_k} \times Y_k$ where Y_k is either a point or a product of odd-dimensional spheres without any S^1-factors. (See the proof of Proposition 5.2.) Then we claim that

(1) there is a one-to-one correspondence between the S^1-factors that appeared in each stage and the elements in $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}$,
(2) $(S^1)^{r_k}$ acts on $\overline{S_k}(\gamma)$ fiberwise, and
(3) the torus action on $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong \overline{S_{n-1}}(\gamma)$ generated by $\{\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}\}_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}, i+j-1=k}$ is an extension of the $(S^1)^{r_k}$-action on $\overline{S_k}(\gamma)$ given in (2).

The first statement (1) is straightforward since each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}$ corresponds to an M_1-block in $W_{i+j-1}(\gamma)$ containing a bottom vertex of W_{i+j-1} so that each $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}$ assigns an S^1-factor in $S_{i+j-1}(\gamma)$. See Section 4.1. The third statement (3) is also clear since each $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ with $i+j-1=k$ descends to a function $\Phi_{\lambda_k}^{i,j}$ on $\overline{S_k}(\gamma)$ where

$$\lambda_k = (\Phi_\lambda^{1,k}(\mathbf{u}), \cdots, \Phi_\lambda^{k,1}(\mathbf{u})).$$

For the second statement (2), fix $k \geq 1$ and consider the k-th stage

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_k(\gamma) = (S^1)^{r_k} \times Y_k & \hookrightarrow & \overline{S_k}(\gamma) \subset (\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{a}, \omega_\mathfrak{a}) \\ & & \downarrow p_k \\ & & \overline{S_{k-1}}(\gamma) \subset (\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b}, \omega_\mathfrak{b}) \end{array} \tag{6.10}$$

of $\overline{S_\bullet}(\gamma)$. As we have seen in the diagram (5.7), $\overline{S_k}(\gamma)$ is a subset of $\mathcal{A}(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})$ where $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1})$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_k)$ with

- $a_i = \Phi_\lambda^{i,k+1-i}(\mathbf{u})$ for $1 \leq i \leq k+1$ and
- $b_j = \Phi_\lambda^{j,k-j}(\mathbf{u})$ for $1 \leq j \leq k$.

Note that $\Phi_\mathfrak{a}^{i,k-i}$ generates a circle action on $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{a}$ whenever $a_i < b_i < a_{i+1}$, see Section 2.4. For any smooth functions f on $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b}$ and $\widehat{f} = f \circ p_k$ on $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{a}$, we denote by ξ_f and $\xi_{\widehat{f}}$ the Hamiltonian vector fields for f and $\widehat{f}$, respectively. Then it follows that $\xi_{\widehat{f}}$ is projectable under p_k and it satisfies $(p_k)_*\xi_{\widehat{f}} = \xi_f$, i.e., $dp_k(\xi_{\widehat{f}})(x) = \xi_f(p_k(x))$ for every $x \in \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b}$ since

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_\mathfrak{b}((p_k)_*\xi_{\widehat{f}}, (p_k)_*(\cdot)) &= (p_k)^*\omega_\mathfrak{b}(\xi_{\widehat{f}}, \cdot) \\ &= \omega_\mathfrak{a}(\xi_{\widehat{f}}, \cdot) \\ &= d\widehat{f}(\cdot) = df((p_k)_*(\cdot)) \\ &= \omega_\mathfrak{b}(\xi_f, (p_k)_*(\cdot)) \end{aligned} \tag{6.11}$$

where the second equality comes from Lemma 5.12. Also, note that $\Phi_\mathfrak{b}^{i,k-i}$ is a constant function on $\mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{b}$ and $\Phi_\mathfrak{a}^{i,k-i} = \Phi_\mathfrak{b}^{i,k-i} \circ p_k$. By applying (6.11), we can see that the Hamiltonian flow generated by $\Phi_\mathfrak{a}^{i,k-i}$ preserves the $(k \times k)$ principal minor, and therefore its Hamiltonian vector field is tangent to the vertical direction of p_k.

Once (1), (2), and (3) are satisfied, its iterated bundle in (6.9) descends to

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})/(S^1)^r \cong \overline{S_{n-1}}(\gamma)' & \xrightarrow{p'_{n-1}} & \overline{S_{n-2}}(\gamma)' & \to & \cdots & \xrightarrow{p'_2} & \overline{S_1}(\gamma)' & \xrightarrow{p'_1} & \overline{S_0}(\gamma)' := \text{point} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ Y_{n-1} & & Y_{n-2} & & \cdots & & Y_1 & & \end{array} \tag{6.12}$$

where $\overline{S_k}(\gamma)' = \overline{S_k}(\gamma)/(S^1)^{r_k+\cdots+r_1}$ and the $(S^1)^{r_k+\cdots+r_1}$-action is generated by $\{\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}\}_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{C}(\gamma)}, i+j-1\leq k}$. Since $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cong T^r \times Y(\mathbf{u})$ for some $Y(\mathbf{u})$ by Proposition 6.7, we have $Y(\mathbf{u}) \cong \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})/T^r \cong \overline{S_\bullet}(\gamma)'$, which completes the proof. □

As an application of Theorem 6.8, one can provide a more explicit description of Gelfand-Cetlin fibers. As mentioned in Remark 4.15, an iterated bundle in Theorem 4.12 is in general *not* trivial. Generally speaking, a torus bundle over a torus might be non-trivial, e.g. Kodaira-Thurston example, a 2-torus bundle over a 2-torus whose first betti number is 3, see [Th]. Yet, Theorem 6.8 guarantees that all torus factors in the iterated bundle can be taken out from $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Using this observation, in some case, the iterated bundle can be characterized explicitly.

Example 6.9. (1) Let $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \simeq \mathcal{F}(6)$ be the co-adjoint orbit associated to $\lambda = (5, 3, 1, -1, -3, -5)$. Consider the face γ_1 defined in Figure 23. The diffeomorphic type of the fiber over a point $\mathbf{u}$ in the relative interior of γ_1 is the product of $(S^1)^7$ and $Y(\mathbf{u})$ by Theorem 6.8. Here, $Y(\mathbf{u})$ is diffeomorphic to $SU(3)$ because $Y(\mathbf{u})$ is the total space of the S^3-bundle over S^5 from Remark 4.15. In sum,

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \simeq (S^1)^7 \times SU(3).$$

(2) Let $\lambda = (3, 3, 3, -3, -3, -3)$. Then, the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is $\mathrm{Gr}(3, 6)$. Consider the face γ_2 defined in Figure 23. We claim that the diffeomorphic type of the fiber over a point in the relative interior of γ_2 is

$$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \simeq (S^1)^3 \times (S^3)^2.$$

Because of Theorem 6.8, the fiber is of the form $(S^1)^3 \times Y(\mathbf{u})$ where $Y(\mathbf{u})$ is an S^3-bundle over S^3. Since every S^3-bundle over S^3 is trivial (see [St]), we have $Y(\mathbf{u}) \simeq (S^3)^2$.



FIGURE 23. Gelfand-Cetlin fibers.

Another application of Theorem 6.8 is to compute the first and the second homotopy groups of each $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ as follows. Let $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$ and let f be the face of $\triangle_\lambda$ containing $\mathbf{u}$ in its relative interior. Also, let γ be the face of Γ_λ corresponding to f. For each $k = 1, \cdots, n-1$, the fibration (6.10) induces the long exact sequence of homotopy groups given by

$$\begin{aligned} \cdots \;\to\; \pi_2(S_k(\gamma)) \;\to\; \pi_2(\overline{S_k}(\gamma)) \;\to\; \pi_2(\overline{S_{k-1}}(\gamma)) \\ \to\; \pi_1(S_k(\gamma)) \;\to\; \pi_1(\overline{S_k}(\gamma)) \;\to\; \pi_1(\overline{S_{k-1}}(\gamma)) \;\to\; \pi_0(S_k(\gamma)) \;\to\; \cdots \end{aligned} \tag{6.13}$$

Proposition 6.10. *Let* $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$. *Then the followings hold.*

- $\pi_2(\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})) = 0$.
- *If* $\mathbf{u}$ *is a point lying on the relative interior of a* r*-dimensional face of* $\triangle_\lambda$, *then*

$$\pi_1(\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})) \cong \mathbb{Z}^r.$$

Proof. Since $S_k(\gamma)$ in (6.10) is a point or a product space of odd dimensional spheres, we have $\pi_2(S_k(\gamma)) = 0$ for every $k = 1, \cdots, n-1$. Note that $\pi_2(\overline{S_1}(\gamma)) = \pi_2(S_1(\gamma)) = 0$. Therefore, it easily follows that $\pi_2(\overline{S_k}(\gamma)) = 0$ for every k by the induction on k. The second statement is deduced from Theorem 6.8, since $\overline{S_\bullet}(\gamma)'$ is simply connected. □

Corollary 6.11. *For a point* $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$, *a fiber* $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ *is a Lagrangian torus if and only if* $\mathbf{u}$ *is an interior point of* $\triangle_\lambda$

Proof. The "if" statement follows immediately from Theorem 6.8, and the "only if" part follows from Proposition 6.10. □

Part 2. Non-displaceability of Lagrangian fibers

7. Criteria for displaceablility of Gelfand-Cetlin fibers

For a given moment polytope, McDuff [McD] and Abreu-Borman-McDuff [ABM] developed the techniques (using *probes*) to detect positions of displaceable toric moment fibers by using combinatorial data of the polytope. In contrast to the toric cases, any partial flag manifold always possesses a non-torus Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fiber unless it is diffeomorphic to a projective space, see Corollary 4.24. The probe method also can be applied to some extent to the case of Gelfand-Cetlin systems, see [Pa] for example. However, it works only for *torus* fibers over interior points of a Gelfand-Cetlin polytope. In this section, we provide several numerical and combinatorial criteria for displaceability of both torus and non-torus Lagrangian fibers of Gelfand-Cetlin systems. (See Proposition 7.4, 7.10, 7.12, 7.18.)

Definition 7.1. Let (M,ω) be a symplectic manifold and let Y be a subset. We say that Y is *displaceable* if there exists a Hamiltonian diffeomorphism $\phi \in \mathrm{Ham}(M,\omega)$ such that

$$\phi(Y) \cap \overline{Y} = \emptyset.$$

If there is no such a diffeomorphism, then we say that Y is *non-displaceable*.

Definition 7.2. Let λ be a sequence of non-increasing real numbers given in (2.4). We say that a face γ is *displaceable* if $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is displaceable for every $\mathbf{u} \in \mathring{\gamma}$.

7.1. Testing by diagonal entries.

For a sequence $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n\}$ in (2.4), let $\Phi_\lambda \colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \triangle_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}}$ be the Gelfand-Cetlin system. For each lattice point $(i,j) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1})^2$ with $2 \leq i+j \leq n$, we denote by $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j} \colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \mathbb{R}$ the (i,j)-th component of Φ_λ. We denote the coordinate system of $\mathbb{R}^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}}$ by $(u_{i,j})_{2\leq i+j\leq n}$ as described in Figure 13.

Note that the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$ can be regarded as a subgroup of $U(n) \subset \mathrm{Ham}(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$. Namely, each element $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ is represented by the $(n \times n)$ elementary matrix, which we still denote by w, whose $(i, w(i))$-th entry is 1 for each $i = 1, \cdots, n$ and other entries are zero. Then each $x = (x_{i,j})_{1\leq i,j\leq n} \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda \subset \mathcal{H}_n$ and $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ satisfies

$$(w \cdot x)_{ij} = (wxw^{-1})_{ij} = x_{w(i),w(j)}$$

for every $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. The following lemma says the diagonal entries of any element $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ are completely determined by $\mathbf{u}$.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_{i,j})_{i,j\geq 1} \in \triangle_\lambda$. Then for any $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$, we have $x_{1,1} = u_{1,1}$ and*

$$x_{k,k} = \sum_{i+j=k+1} u_{i,j} - \sum_{i+j=k} u_{i,j}.$$

for $1 < k \leq n$ where

$$u_{i,j} := \lambda_i \quad \text{for} \quad i+j = n+1.$$

Proof. It is straightforward from the fact that

$$\mathrm{tr}(x^{(k)}) = x_{1,1} + \cdots + x_{k,k} = \sum_{i+j=k+1} u_{i,j}$$

for every $k = 1, \cdots, n$ where $x^{(k)}$ denotes the $k \times k$ principal minor matrix of x. □

For the sake of simplicity, let $d_1(\mathbf{u}) := u_{1,1}$ and

$$d_k(\mathbf{u}) := \sum_{i+j=k+1} u_{i,j} - \sum_{i+j=k} u_{i,j} \tag{7.1}$$

for $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$ and $1 < k \leq n$ so that $x_{k,k} = d_k(\mathbf{u})$ for every $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ by Lemma 7.3. We then state a numerical criterion for displaceable fibers.

Proposition 7.4. *Let* $\mathbf{u}$ *be a point in the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope* $\triangle_\lambda$*. If the fiber* $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ *is non-displaceable, then*

$$d_1(\mathbf{u}) = \cdots = d_n(\mathbf{u}).$$

Proof. Note that $\Phi_\lambda^{1,1}(x) = x_{1,1}$ and $\Phi_\lambda^{1,1}(w \cdot x) = x_{w(1),w(1)}$ for $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. If $d_1(\mathbf{u}) \neq d_k(\mathbf{u})$ for some k with $1 \leq k \leq n$, then

$$\Phi_\lambda^{1,1}(x) = x_{1,1} = d_1(\mathbf{u}) \neq d_k(\mathbf{u}) = x_{k,k} = x_{w(1),w(1)} = \Phi_\lambda^{1,1}(w \cdot x)$$

for every $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ where w is the transposition $(1, k)$. Thus,

$$w \cdot \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \cap \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) = \emptyset$$

and hence $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is displaceable. This completes the proof. □

In a Gelfand-Cetlin system, Proposition 7.4 implies that almost all fibers are displaceable.

Corollary 7.5. *For any Gelfand-Cetlin system* Φ_λ*, there exists a dense open subset* $\mathcal{U}$ *of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope* $\triangle_\lambda$ *such that for each* $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ *the fiber* $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ *is displaceable.*

Remark 7.6. This contrasts to the toric case. There is a symplectic toric orbifold which contains an open subset $\mathcal{U}$ of a moment polytope such that every fiber over a point in $\mathcal{U}$ is non-displaceable, see Wilson-Woodwards [WW] and Cho-Poddar [CP].

Example 7.7. We demonstrate how to apply Proposition 7.4 to detect displaceable fibers.

(1) **[Complex projective space]:** Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_1 = n,\ \lambda_2 = \cdots = \lambda_n = 0\}$. The co-adjoint oribt $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ is a complex projective space $\mathbb{C}P^{n-1}$ equipped with the Fubini-Study form ω_λ. For instance, when $n = 5$, the ladder diagram Γ_λ is given as follows.

$$\begin{array}{cccccc} & & & & & u_{1,5} = 5 \\ \hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{u_{1,4}} & & & & & 0 = u_{2,4} \\ \hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{u_{1,3}} & & & & 0 & 0 = u_{3,3} \\ \hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{u_{1,2}} & & & 0 & 0 & 0 = u_{4,2} \\ \hline \multicolumn{1}{|c|}{u_{1,1}} & & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 = u_{5,1} \\ \hline \end{array}$$

FIGURE 24. The case of $n = 5$

In this case, every component $\Phi_\lambda^{i,j}$ of the Gelfand-Cetlin system Φ_λ is a *constant* function unless $i = 1$ so that $\triangle_\lambda$ is an $(n-1)$-dimensional simplex. For any $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$ and $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$, we have

- $x_{1,1} = d_1(\mathbf{u}) = u_{1,1}$,
- $x_{k,k} = d_k(\mathbf{u}) = u_{1,k} - u_{1,k-1}$ for $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, and
- $x_{n,n} = d_n(\mathbf{u}) = u_{1,n} - u_{1,n-1} = n - u_{1,n-1}$.

Then $d_1(\mathbf{u}) = \cdots = d_n(\mathbf{u})$ implies that $d_k(\mathbf{u}) = 1$ for every $1 \leq k \leq n$. Therefore, by Proposition 7.4, if $d_k(\mathbf{u}) \neq 1$ for some k, then $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is displaceable. The only possible candidate for a non-displaceable fiber is $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_0)$ where $\mathbf{u}_0$ is the center of $\triangle_\lambda$, i.e., $\mathbf{u}_0 = (u_{i,j})$ with $u_{1,j} = j$ for $j = 1, \cdots, n-1$. Note that it has been shown by Cho [Cho1] that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_0)$ is non-displaceable. Therefore, $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_0)$ is a *stem*.[10]

(2) **[Complete flag manifold** $\mathcal{F}(3)$**]:** We reproduce the result of Pabiniak [Pa] on displaceability of a (unique) non-torus Gelfand-Cetlin Lagrangian fiber in $\mathcal{F}(3)$. Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_1, 0, -\lambda_2\}$ for $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$ so that $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ is a complete flag manifold of $\mathbb{C}^3$ and it admits a unique proper Lagrangian face, a vertex v_3, of $\triangle_\lambda$ in Example 3.5, see Figure 25 below.

[10] A fiber of a moment map is called a *stem* if all other fibers are displaceable. See [EP2].



FIGURE 25. The Lagrangian face of Γ_λ

For any $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(v_3)$, we can easily see that $x_{1,1} = x_{1,2} = x_{2,1} = x_{2,2} = 0$, and $x_{3,3} = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$. By Proposition 7.4, we can conclude that $\Phi^{-1}(v_3)$ is displaceable whenever $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$. We will prove in Section 8 that $\Phi^{-1}(v_3)$ is non-displaceable when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$.

(3) **[Complex Grassmannian** $\mathrm{Gr}(2,4)$**]:** Let $\lambda = \{t, t, 0, 0\}$ for $t > 0$. By Corollary 4.23, the edge e in Figure 26 of $\triangle_\lambda$ is the unique proper Lagrangian face of Γ_λ.



FIGURE 26. Lagrangian face of Γ_λ

For a positive real number a with $0 \leq a \leq t$, we consider the point $r_a \in e$ given as follows.



Nohara-Ueda [NU1] proved that the every fiber over the edge except the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(r_{\frac{t}{2}})$ is displaceable and moreover $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(r_{\frac{t}{2}})$ is non-displaceable. Our combinatorial test (Proposition 7.4) easily tells us that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(r_a)$ is displaceable unless $2a = t$.

(4) **[Complex Grassmannian** $\mathrm{Gr}(2,6)$**]:** Let $\lambda = \{6, 6, 0, 0, 0, 0\}$. By Example 4.25, there are exactly four proper Lagrangian faces γ_2, γ_3, γ_4, and $\gamma_{2,4}$ of Γ_λ as follows.



FIGURE 27. Four proper Lagrangian faces of Γ_λ

First, consider two faces γ_3 and $\gamma_{2,4}$. By Proposition 7.4, we can easily check that every Lagrangian fiber over a point in γ_3 (resp. $\gamma_{2,4}$) is displaceable except for the fiber at $\mathbf{u}_3$ (resp. $\mathbf{u}_{2,4}$) described in Figure 28.



FIGURE 28. Lagrangian faces γ_3 and $\gamma_{2,4}$

For the other faces γ_2 and γ_4, again by Proposition 7.4, every fiber is displaceable except for the one-parameter families of Lagrangian fibers $\mathbf{u}_2(t)$ and $\mathbf{u}_4(t)$ $(-1 < t < 1)$ described in Figure 29 in γ_2 and γ_4, respectively.



FIGURE 29. Lagrangian faces γ_2 and γ_4

In Section 7.2, we will give another method for detecting displaceability of fibers and show that γ_2 and γ_4 are indeed displaceable. Consequently, there are exactly two non-torus Lagrangian fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_3)$ and $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_{2,4})$ that might be non-displaceable.

7.2. **Symmetry on Γ_λ : complex Grassmannian cases.**

In this section, we study displaceability of non-torus Lagrangian fibers of Gelfand-Cetlin systems on complex Grassmannians. Let $\mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$ be the Grassmannian of complex k-dimensional subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^n$. Since $\mathrm{Gr}(k,n) \cong \mathrm{Gr}(n-k,n)$, without loss of generality, we assume that $n-k \geq k$.

Let $\lambda = \{\underbrace{t,\cdots,t}_{k \text{ times}}, \underbrace{0,\cdots,0}_{n-k \text{ times}}\}$ for $t>0$ so that

$$\mathrm{Gr}(k,n) \cong \mathcal{O}_\lambda.$$

We start with the following series of algebraic lemmas which seems to be well-known.

Lemma 7.8. *Let A be any complex $(n \times k)$ matrix. Then AA^* and A^*A have the same non-zero eigenvalues with the same multiplicities.*

Proof. Recall that a singular value decomposition yields

$$A = U\Sigma V^*$$

where U is an $(n \times n)$ unitary matrix, Σ is an $(n \times k)$ matrix such that $\Sigma_{i,j} = 0$ unless $i = j$, and V is a $(k \times k)$ unitary matrix. Then $AA^* = U\Sigma\Sigma^*U^*$ and $A^*A = V\Sigma^*\Sigma V^*$ are unitary diagonalizations of AA^* and A^*A respectively. Since $\Sigma\Sigma^*$ and $\Sigma^*\Sigma$ have the same nonzero eigenvalues with the same multiplicities, this completes the proof. □

Lemma 7.9. *Any element $x \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ can be expressed by*

$$x = XX^*$$

for some $(n \times k)$ matrix $X = [v_1, \cdots, v_k]$ such that

- *$|v_i|^2 = t$ for every $i = 1, \cdots, k$, and*
- *$\langle v_i, v_j \rangle = 0$ for every $i \neq j$*

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ means the standard hermitian inner product on $\mathbb{C}^n$. In particular, we have

$$X^*X = tI_k$$

where I_k is the $(k \times k)$ identity matrix.

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$. Since x is semi-positive definite by our choice of λ, there exists an $(n \times n)$ lower triangular matrix L having non-negative diagonal entries such that

$$x = LL^*. \tag{7.2}$$

The expression (7.2) is called a *Cholesky factorization of* x, see [HJ, Corollary 7.2.9]. Let $L = U\Sigma V^*$ be a singular value decomposition of L. In this case, the matrices U, Σ, and V are all $(n \times n)$ matrices. Then we have

$$x = LL^* = U\Sigma\Sigma^* U^* \quad \text{where} \quad \Sigma\Sigma^* = \begin{pmatrix} tI_k & 0 \\ 0 & O_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $D = D^* = \sqrt{\Sigma\Sigma^*}$ so that $x = UDD^*U^*$ and denote by $U = [u_1, \cdots, u_n]$. Since $UD = \sqrt{t}\cdot[u_1, \cdots, u_k, 0, \cdots, 0]$, we have $UDD^*U^* = UD(UD)^* = XX^*$ where X is taken to be the $(n \times k)$ matrix

$$X = [v_1, \cdots, v_k] = \sqrt{t} \cdot [u_1, \cdots, u_k].$$

This finishes the proof. □

Now, we consider Lagrangian faces of particular types in the ladder diagram Γ_λ described as follows. Let ${}^{(0,i)}\square_k$ denote the $(k \times k)$ square whose upper-left corner is $(0, i)$ so that the vertices of ${}^{(0,i)}\square_k$ are $(0, i), (k, i), (k, i-k)$ and $(0, i-k)$. Let γ_i be the graph drawn by all positive paths not passing through the interior of the square ${}^{(0,i)}\square_k$. Hence, γ_i contains exactly one $(k \times k)$-sized simple closed region ${}^{(0,i)}\square_k$ and the other simple closed regions in γ_i are unit squares, see Figure 30. Note that γ_i is a Lagrangian face.



FIGURE 30. Ladder diagram Γ_λ and Lagrangian faces $\{\gamma_i\}_{k \le i \le n-k}$

Proposition 7.10. *For each $k \le i \le n-k$, there exists a permutation matrix $w \in U(n)$ such that*

$$w \cdot \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\gamma}_i) \subset \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\gamma_{n-i}).$$

In particular,

$$w \cdot \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\gamma}_i) \cap \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\gamma}_i) = \emptyset.$$

unless $n = 2i$. Consequently, the face γ_i is displaceable provided that $n \neq 2i$.

Proof. Let u be any point in $\mathring{\gamma}_i$. Then we have

$$u_{1,i} = u_{2,i-1} = \cdots = u_{k,i-k+1},$$

which implies that for every $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$, the i-th principal minor $x^{(i)}$ of x has eigenvalues $u_{1,i}$ with multiplicity k and 0 with multiplicity $i-k$.

Now, choose any $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$. Then Lemma 7.9 implies that there exists an $(n \times k)$ matrix

$$X = (v_1, \cdots, v_k) = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \vdots \\ w_n \end{pmatrix}$$

such that $x = XX^*$ and it satisfies

- $|v_j|^2 = t$ for every $j = 1, \cdots, k$, and
- $\langle v_j, v_{j'} \rangle = 0$ for every $j \neq j'$.

Now, we divide X into two submatrices $X^{(i)}$ and $\check{X}^{(i)}$ where

$$X^{(i)} := \left(v_1^{(i)}, \cdots, v_k^{(i)}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \\ \vdots \\ w_i \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \check{X}^{(i)} := \left(\check{v}_1^{(i)}, \cdots, \check{v}_k^{(i)}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} w_{i+1} \\ \vdots \\ w_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

In other words, $X^{(i)}$ (resp. $\check{X}^{(i)}$) is the $(i \times k)$ (resp. $((n-i) \times k)$) submatrix of X obtained by deleting all ℓ-th rows of X for $\ell > i$ (resp. $\ell \leq i$). Thus we have

$$x^{(i)} = X^{(i)}(X^{(i)})^*.$$

Then Lemma 7.8 implies that $x^{(i)} = X^{(i)}(X^{(i)})^*$ and $(X^{(i)})^* X^{(i)}$ have the same non-zero eigenvalue $u_{1,i}$ with the same multiplicity k. Since $(X^{(i)})^* X^{(i)}$ is a $(k \times k)$ matrix, we get

$$(X^{(i)})^* X^{(i)} = u_{1,i} \cdot I_k.$$

In particular, we have

- $|v_j^{(i)}|^2 = u_{1,i}$ for every $j = 1, \cdots, k$, and
- $\langle v_j^{(i)}, v_{j'}^{(i)} \rangle = 0$ for every $j \neq j'$,

i.e., the columns of $X^{(i)}$ are orthogonal to each other and have the same square norm equal to $u_{1,i}$. This implies that $\check{X}^{(i)} = [\check{v}_1^{(i)}, \cdots, \check{v}_k^{(i)}]$ satisfies

- $|\check{v}_j{}^{(i)}|^2 = t - u_{1,i}$ for every $j = 1, \cdots, k$, and
- $\langle \check{v}_j^{(i)}, \check{v}_{j'}^{(i)} \rangle = 0$ for every $j \neq j'$

so that we have

$$(\check{X}^{(i)})^* \check{X}^{(i)} = (t - u_{1,i}) \cdot I_k.$$

Now, let $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n \subset U(n)$ be any permutation satisfying $w(i+j) = j$ for $j = 1, \cdots, n-i$. Then $(wX)^{(n-i)} = \check{X}^{(i)}$ and the following matrix

$$w \cdot x = wxw^{-1} = wXX^*w^* = (wX)(wX)^*.$$

has the $(n-i)$-th principal minor

$$(w \cdot x)^{(n-i)} = (wX)^{(n-i)}((wX)^{(n-i)})^* = (\check{X}^{(i)})(\check{X}^{(i)})^*.$$

Again by Lemma 7.8, the nonzero eigenvalue of $(w \cdot x)^{(n-i)}$ is $t - u_{1,i}$ with multiplicity k and zero with multiplicity $n-i-k$. Thus we have

$$\Phi_\lambda^{1,n-i}(w \cdot x) = \Phi_\lambda^{2,n-i-1}(w \cdot x) = \cdots = \Phi_\lambda^{k,n-i-k+1}(w \cdot x) = t - u_{1,i}.$$

Therefore, we have $\Phi_\lambda(w \cdot x) \in \gamma_{n-i}$. In particular if $n - i \neq i$, then $\Phi_\lambda(w \cdot x)$ is not lying on $\mathring{\gamma}_i$ since $\mathring{\gamma}_i \cap \gamma_{n-i} = \emptyset$. □

Example 7.11. Let us reconsider the Lagrangian faces γ_2 and γ_4 in Example 7.7 (4), which is the case where $n = 6$ and $k = 2$. Then

$$n = 6 \neq 2 \cdot 2 = 2i \text{ for } i = 2, \text{ and } n = 6 \neq 2 \cdot 4 = 2i \text{ for } i = 4.$$

Thus the faces γ_2 and γ_4 are displaceable by Proposition 7.10. For the face γ_3 in Example 7.7 (4), however, we have

$$n = 6 = 2 \cdot 3 = 2i \quad \text{and} \quad i = 3$$

so that we cannot determine displaceability of γ_3 by using Proposition 7.10.

Now, we extend Proposition 7.10 to Lagrangian faces containing multiple squares of type ${}^{(0,\bullet)}\square_k$ in Γ_λ. For a sequence $(i_1, \cdots, i_r)$ satisfying

$$\begin{cases} k \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_r \leq n-k, \\ i_{s+1} - i_s \geq k \text{ for each } s, \end{cases} \tag{7.3}$$

let $\gamma_{i_1,\cdots,i_r}$ be the Lagrangian face of Γ_λ which contains r simple closed regions $\{C_1\cdots,C_r\}$ where C_s is the square ${}^{(0,i_s)}\square_k$ and the other simple closed regions of $\gamma_{i_1,\cdots,i_r}$ are of size 1×1, see $\gamma_{2,4}$ in Figure 27 for example.

Proposition 7.12. *Suppose $\{i_1,\cdots,i_r\}$ is given satisfying (7.3). Then there is a permutation $w\in\mathfrak{S}_n$ such that*

$$w\cdot\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\gamma}_{i_1,\cdots,i_r})\cap\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\gamma}_{i_1,\cdots,i_r})=\emptyset \tag{7.4}$$

unless $i_s=s\cdot i_1$ for every $s=1,\cdots,r+1$ provided that $i_{r+1}:=n$.

Remark 7.13. Proposition 7.10 can be obtained by Proposition 7.12 by taking $r=1$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{u}\in\mathring{\gamma}_{i_1,\cdots,i_r}$. Then $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies

$$u_{1,i_s}=u_{2,i_s-1}=\cdots=u_{k,i_s-k+1}$$

for every $s=1,\cdots,r$.

For any $x\in\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$, Lemma 7.9 implies that there exists an $(n\times k)$ matrix $X=[v_1,\cdots,v_k]$ such that

- $x=XX^*$,
- $|v_j|^2=t$ for every $j=1,\cdots,k$, and
- $\langle v_j,v_{j'}\rangle=0$ for $j\neq j'$.

Then we can divide X into $r+1$ submatrices $X^{(i_1)}_{(i_0)},X^{(i_2)}_{(i_1)},\cdots,X^{(i_r)}_{(i_{r-1})},X^{(i_{r+1})}_{(i_r)}$ of X (provided that $i_0:=0$ and $i_{r+1}:=n$) where

$$X^{(i_{s+1})}_{(i_s)}=\left(v_1{}^{(i_{s+1})}_{(i_s)},\cdots,v_k{}^{(i_{s+1})}_{(i_s)}\right):=\begin{pmatrix}w_{i_s+1}\\ \vdots\\ w_{i_{s+1}}\end{pmatrix}$$

for each $s=0,\cdots,r$. In other words, $X^{(i_{s+1})}_{(i_s)}$ is the $((i_{s+1}-i_s)\times k)$ submatrix of X obtained by deleting all ℓ-th rows of X for $\ell>i_{s+1}$ and $\ell\leq i_s$. By using Lemma 7.8 and Lemma 7.9, it is not hard to show that

- $|v_j{}^{(i_{s+1})}_{(i_s)}|^2=u_{1,i_{s+1}}-u_{1,i_s}$ for every $j=1,\cdots,k$ and $s=0,\cdots,r$, and
- $\langle v_j{}^{(i_{s+1})}_{(i_s)},v_{j'}{}^{(i_{s+1})}_{(i_s)}\rangle=0$ for $j\neq j'$.

Now, suppose that

$$w\cdot\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\gamma}_{i_1,\cdots,i_r})\cap\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathring{\gamma}_{i_1,\cdots,i_r})\neq\emptyset \tag{7.5}$$

for every $w\in\mathfrak{S}_n$. We claim that

$$i_s=s\cdot i_1\quad\text{ for every }s=1,\cdots,r+1\quad\text{ where }\quad i_{r+1}:=n.$$

To show this, consider $w:=w(s,s')\in\mathfrak{S}_n\subset U(n)$ for any $s,s'\in\{1,\cdots,r+1\}$ with $s<s'$ defined by

$$\begin{gathered}\{1,\cdots,i_s,\underline{i_s+1,\cdots,i_{s+1}},i_{s+1}+1,\cdots,i_{s'},\underline{i_{s'}+1,\cdots,i_{s'+1}},i_{s'+1}+1,\cdots,n\}\\ \Big\downarrow w\\ \{1,\cdots,i_s,\underline{i_{s'}+1,\cdots,i_{s'+1}},i_{s+1}+1,\cdots,i_{s'},\underline{i_s+1,\cdots,i_{s+1}},i_{s'+1}+1,\cdots,n\}.\end{gathered}$$

Then we can easily see that the permutation w swaps the position of $X^{(i_{s+1})}_{(i_s)}$ with $X^{(i_{s'+1})}_{(i_{s'})}$ in X so that

$$\Phi_\lambda(w\cdot x)\in\gamma_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_r}$$

for some $k\leq i'_1<\cdots<i'_r\leq n-k$ where

$$i'_{s+1}=i_s+(i_{s'+1}-i_{s'}).$$

By our assumption (7.5), we have $\gamma_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_r}\cap\mathring{\gamma}_{i_1,\cdots,i_r}\neq\emptyset$. Since two faces $\gamma_{i'_1,\cdots,i'_r}$ and $\gamma_{i_1,\cdots,i_r}$ have the same dimensions, they must coincide and hence

$$i'_{s+1}=i_s+(i_{s'+1}-i_{s'})=i_{s+1}.$$

Therefore, we may deduce that

$$i_{r+1}-i_r=i_r-i_{r-1}=\cdots=i_2-i_1=i_1-i_0=i_1,$$

which completes the proof. □

Corollary 7.14. *Let $\lambda = \{t, t, 0, \cdots, 0\}$ so that $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \cong \mathrm{Gr}(2, n)$. If n is prime, then every proper Lagrangian face of the Gelfand-Cetlin system on $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ is displaceable.*

Proof. Note that every proper Lagrangian face of Γ_λ is of the form $\gamma_{i_1,\cdots,i_r}$ for some $i_1, \cdots, i_r$. By Proposition 7.12, i_1 divides n where $2 \leq i_1 \leq n-2$ which is impossible since n is prime. Thus there is no proper non-displaceable Lagrangian face of Γ_λ. □

7.3. **Comparison of norms.**

In this section, we give another numerical criterion for detecting displaceable fibers of Gelfand-Cetlin systems.

Consider the ladder diagram Γ_λ for a sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \cdots, \lambda_n)$ given in (2.4). Without loss of generality, we may assume that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k = 0. \tag{7.6}$$

Under the assumption (7.6), Proposition 7.4 is rephrased as follows.

Lemma 7.15. *For a non-increasing sequnece λ from (2.4) satisfying (7.6), suppose that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is non-displaceable for $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$. Then for any $1 \leq k \leq n$, we have*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} u_{j,k-j+1} = 0. \tag{7.7}$$

Proof. Recall that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} d_k(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \lambda_k = 0$$

where $d_k(\mathbf{u})$ is defined in (7.1). Since $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is non-displaceable, we have $d_1(\mathbf{u}) = d_2(\mathbf{u}) = \cdots = d_n(\mathbf{u})$ by Proposition 7.4 so that every $d_k(\mathbf{u})$ should be equal to zero. □

From now on, we only consider a point $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$ satisfying (7.7) for every $2 \leq k \leq n$. Otherwise, Lemma 7.15 asserts that $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is displaceable.

We now define two numerals, $x(i)$ and $u(i)$. First, for any $(n \times n)$ hermitian matrix $x \in \mathcal{H}_n$, we set

$$x(i) := \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} x_{ij}^2 \tag{7.8}$$

for every $i = 2, \cdots, n$.

$$\begin{array}{l} x(2) = x_{21}^2 \\ x(3) = x_{31}^2 + x_{32}^2 \\ \vdots \\ x(n) = \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} x_{nj}^2 \end{array} \quad \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & * & \cdots & \cdots & * \\ * & x_{22} & \cdots & \cdots & * \\ * & * & x_{33} & \cdots & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ * & * & * & \cdots & x_{nn} \end{pmatrix}$$

Also, for any $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$, we define

$$u(i) := \sum_{j=1}^{i} u_{j,i-j+1}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} u_{j,i-j}^2 \tag{7.9}$$

for every $i = 2, \cdots, n$.



$$u(3) = u_{1,3}^2 + u_{2,2}^2 + u_{1,3}^2 - u_{1,2}^2 - u_{2,1}^2$$
$$u(2) = u_{1,2}^2 + u_{2,1}^2 - u_{1,1}^2$$

We would like to calculate (7.8) by reading off (7.9) from the ladder diagram Γ_λ. For that purpose, recall that

$$\mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b}) \quad = \quad \{x \in \mathcal{H}_{k+1} \mid \mathrm{sp}(x) = \{a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}\},\ \mathrm{sp}(x^{(k)}) = \{b_1, \cdots, b_k\}\}$$

for sequences of real numbers $\mathfrak{a} = (a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1})$ and $\mathfrak{b} = (b_1, \cdots, b_k)$ such that

$$a_1 \geq b_1 \geq a_2 \geq b_2 \geq \cdots \geq a_k \geq b_k \geq a_{k+1}.$$

Also recall that every $x \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ is conjugate to some matrix of the following form

$$\begin{pmatrix} b_1 & & 0 & \overline{z}_1 \\ & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & & b_k & \overline{z}_k \\ z_1 & \cdots & z_k & z_{k+1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad z_{k+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i - \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i. \tag{7.10}$$

Lemma 7.16. *Suppose that* $\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i = \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i = 0$. *Then any hermitian matrix* $x \in \mathcal{A}_{k+1}(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ *satisfies*

$$2x(k+1) = \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i^2$$

where $x(k+1)$ *is defined in* (7.8).

Proof. By Lemma 5.11, x is of the form

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathfrak{b}} & \overline{z}^t \\ z & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} g^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathfrak{b}} & g\overline{z}^t \\ zg^{-1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

for some $g \in U(k)$ where $I_{\mathfrak{b}} = \mathrm{diag}(b_1, \cdots, b_k)$. Under the our standing assumption, we have $z_{k+1} = 0$ in the matrix expression (7.10). Note that the equation (5.2)[11] reads

$$\det(\xi I - Z_{(\mathfrak{a},\mathfrak{b})}(z)) = \xi \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k}(\xi - b_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\frac{|z_i|^2}{\xi - b_i} \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{k}(\xi - b_m)\right) = 0,$$

which has the solutions $\xi = a_1, \cdots, a_{k+1}$. We then have

$$\xi \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{k}(\xi - b_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k}\left(\frac{|z_i|^2}{\xi - b_i} \cdot \prod_{m=1}^{k}(\xi - b_m)\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{k+1}(\xi - a_i)$$

Comparing the coefficients of ξ^{k-1} in the above equation, we get

$$\sum_{i<j} a_i a_j = \sum_{i<j} b_i b_j - \sum_{i=1}^{k} |z_i|^2.$$

Equivalently, we have

$$|z|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} |z_i|^2 = \frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} b_i^2\right).$$

Since the standard linear $U(k)$-action on $\mathbb{C}^k$ preserves the Euclidean norm, we have $|z|^2 = |zg^{-1}|^2 = x(k+1)$ and it finishes the proof. □

[11] we use ξ instead of x in the equation (5.2) for avoiding confusion since the latter x stands for a matrix element in this section.

Lemma 7.17. *For any $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$, it satisfies*

$$2x(i) = u(i) \tag{7.11}$$

for every $i = 2, \cdots, n$.

Proof. For each $k = 2, \cdots, n$, let

$$\mathfrak{a} := \{u_{1,k}, u_{2,k-1}, \cdots, u_{k,1}\}, \quad \mathfrak{b} = \{u_{1,k-1}, u_{2,k-2}, \cdots, u_{k-1,1}\}.$$

Since $x^{(k)} \in \mathcal{A}_k(\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{b})$ and u satisfies (7.7), (7.11) follows from Lemma 7.16. □

By simply comparing $u(i)$'s, we obtain the following criterion.

Proposition 7.18. *$\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ is displaceable if there exists k with $2 \leq k \leq n-1$ such that*

$$u(k) > u(k+1).$$

Proof. Suppose that there exists k with $2 \leq k \leq n-1$ satisfying $u(k) > u(k+1)$. Take a permutation $w = (k, k+1) \in \mathfrak{S}_n \subset U(n)$. Then we can easily check that

$$\Phi_\lambda(w \cdot x)(k) < \Phi_\lambda(w \cdot x)(k+1)$$

for every $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$. In particular, $\Phi_\lambda(w \cdot x) \neq \mathbf{u}$ for every $x \in \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$. This finishes the proof. □

Example 7.19. Let $\lambda = \{3, 1, -1, 3\}$. Then $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(4)$. Let us consider a point $\mathbf{u}_t = (0, 0, 0, t, 0, -t)$ contained in the following Lagrangian face γ.

$\gamma \ni \mathbf{u}_t =$

3				
t	1			
0	0	-1		
0	0	$-t$	-3	

Note that $d_1(\mathbf{u}_t) = d_2(\mathbf{u}_t) = d_3(\mathbf{u}_t) = d_4(\mathbf{u}_t) = 0$, so Proposition 7.4 does *not* imply that the fiber over u_t is displaceable. Nonetheless, Proposition 7.18 can say something more. We compute $u(2) = 0$, $u(3) = 2t^2$ and $u(4) = 20 - 2t^2$. Then, the fiber over $\mathbf{u}_t$ is displaceable if $2t^2 > 20 - 2t^2$, i.e., $\sqrt{5} < t \leq 3$.

8. Non-displaceable fibers of Gelfand-Cetlin systems

The rest of the paper concerns non-displaceability of Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers. Let

$$\lambda = \{\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \cdots > \lambda_n\}$$

be a decreasing sequence of real numbers. Consider the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$, which is diffeomorphic to a complete flag manifold, together with the Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form ω_λ. When ω_λ is monotone, we will show that there exists a continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers over the line segment connecting the center [12] of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ and the center [13] of a certain Lagrangian face of $\triangle_\lambda$.

A non-displaceable Lagrangian torus fiber of a Gelfand-Cetlin system is firstly detected by Nishinou, Nohara, and Ueda.

Theorem 8.1 (Theorem 12.1 in [NNU1])**.** *For any non-increasing sequence λ of real numbers, the Gelfand-Cetlin system $\Phi_\lambda \colon (\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda) \to \triangle_\lambda$ admits a non-displaceable Lagrangian torus fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_0)$ over the center $\mathbf{u}_0$ of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$.*

[12] For any convex polytope $P_0 \subset \mathbb{R}^N$, Fukaya, Oh, Ohta, and Ono [FOOO3, Proposition 9.1] describe a unique interior point (which they denoted by u_0 or P_K) and we call it the *center* of P_0. For the case when P_0 is a moment polytope of a compact symplectic toric manifold, the center u_0 of P_0 is a point over which the corresponding toric fiber is non-displaceable, see Theorem 1.5 and Proposition 4.7 in [FOOO3] for more details. Notice that the center is *not* meant to be the barycenter of a polytope. The center and the barycenter are in general different.

[13] Regarding a face as a convex polytope, the center of this polytope is said to be the *center* of the face.

In the proof of Theorem 8.1, they calculate the potential function as in (9.4) using a toric degeneration in Theorem 9.1 and find a weak bounding cochain $b \in H^1(\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_0); \Lambda_0)$ such that the deformed Floer cohomology $HF((\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_0), b); \Lambda)$ is non-vanishing.

More recently, Nohara and Ueda find a non-displaceable Lagrangian non-torus Gelfand-Cetlin fiber on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \cong \mathrm{Gr}(2,4)$.

Theorem 8.2 ([NU2]). *Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2 > \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = -2\}$. Consider the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$, the Grassmannian $\mathrm{Gr}(2,4)$. Let γ be the unique Lagrangina face of Γ_λ in Example 4.10. Then, the Gelfand-Cetlin fiber over the center of γ is non-displaceable. Moreover, any other Gelfand-Cetlin fibers located at its interior are displaceable.*

In the proof of Theorem 8.2, Nohara and Ueda manually find a holomorphic disc bounded by the fiber over the center of γ. Using the homogeneity [14] of the fiber in $\mathrm{Gr}(2,4)$, the moduli space of holomorphic discs can be recovered from the one representative of such a holomorphic disc and is regular. It seems that it is hard to calculate a Floer cohomology of a non-torus Gelfand-Cetlin Lagrangian fiber in a general partial flag manifold.

Here we briefly sketch the way how to prove that a certain non-torus Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers is non-displaceable in our situation. We first locate a half-open line segment $[\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{a}) \subset \triangle_\lambda$ where $\mathbf{u}_0$ is the center of $\triangle_\lambda$ and $\mathbf{a}$ is a point lying on some Lagrangian face of $\triangle_\lambda$. Then, in some cases, we are able to show that each torus fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ ($\mathbf{u} \in [\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{a})$) is non-displaceable by showing that a bulk-deformed Lagrangian Floer cohomology (with a certain bulk-deformation parameter and a weak bounding cochain) is non-zero, see Section 9. Since the non-toric Lagrangian submanifold $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$ is realized as the "limit" of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori, we may deduce that the fiber $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{a})$ is also non-displaceable, see Proposition 9.13.

We describe line segments over which the fibers are non-displaceable in the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ explicitly. If the symplectic form ω_λ is monotone, the center of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ is expressed as follows. Recall that the symplectic form ω_λ is monotone if and only if

$$\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1} = \lambda_{n-1} - \lambda_{n-2} = \cdots = \lambda_2 - \lambda_1$$

by Proposition 2.3. By scaling ω_λ if necessary, we may assume that

$$\lambda = \{\lambda_i := n - 2i + 1 : \ i = 1, \cdots, n\}, \tag{8.1}$$

which is the case where $[\omega_\lambda] = c_1(T\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$. The polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ is of dimension $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$. It turns out that $\triangle_\lambda$ is a reflexive [15] polytope, see [BCKV, Corollary 2.2.4] or [NNU1, Lemma 3.12]. One well-known fact on a reflexive polytope is that there exists a unique lattice point in its interior, that is exactly the center of the polytope.

We start from the simplest case where the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ of a sequence $\lambda = \{\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3\}$. In this case, Pabiniak investigates displaceable Gelfand-Cetlin fibers.

Theorem 8.3 ([Pa]). *For $\lambda = \{\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \lambda_3\}$, let $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ be the co-adjoint orbit, which is a complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(3)$ equipped with ω_λ.*

1. *If ω_λ is not monotone, i.e. $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) \neq (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$, then all Gelfand-Cetlin fibers but one over the center are displaceable.*
2. *If ω_λ is monotone i.e. $(\lambda_1 - \lambda_2) = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_3)$, then all Gelfand-Cetlin fibers but the fibers over the line segment*

$$I := \left\{(u_{1,1}, u_{1,2}, u_{2,1}) = (0, a - t, -a + t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : 0 \leq t \leq a\right\} \tag{8.2}$$

are displaceable where $2a = \lambda_1 - \lambda_2$. Observe that the line segment I is the red line in Figure 31.

Note that the line segment I connects the center $(0, a, -a)$ of the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ and the position $(0,0,0)$ of the Lagrangian 3-sphere. Combining it with Theorem 8.1, Theorem 8.3 finishes the classification of displaceable and non-displaceable fibers of the Gelfand-Cetlin system Φ_λ for the non-monotone case.

[14] This notion is introduced by Evans and Lekili, see [EL, Definition 1.1.1].

[15] A convex lattice polytope $\mathcal{P}$ is called *reflexive* if its dual polytope $\mathcal{P}^*$ is also a lattice polytope.

The following theorem asserts every Gelfand-Cetlin fiber in the family $\{\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u}) \mid \mathbf{u} \in I\}$ is non-displaceable. Thus, together with Theorem 8.3, our result provides the complete classification of displaceable and non-displaceable Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers when ω_λ is monotone. We postpone its proof until Section 9.3.

Theorem 8.4. *Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_1 = 2 > \lambda_2 = 0 > \lambda_3 = -2\}$. Consider the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$, a complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(3)$ equipped with the monotone Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form ω_λ, Then the Gelfand-Cetlin fiber over a point $\mathbf{u} \in \triangle_\lambda$ is non-displaceable if and only if $\mathbf{u} \in I$ where*

$$I := \big\{(u_{1,1}, u_{1,2}, u_{2,1}) = (0, 1-t, -1+t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \le t \le 1\big\} \tag{8.3}$$

In particular, the Lagrangian 3-sphere $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(0,0,0)$ is non-displaceable.



FIGURE 31. The positions of non-displaceable Gelfand-Cetlin Lagrangian fibers in $\mathcal{F}(3)$.

Remark 8.5. The fiber over the center $(0,1,-1)$ of $\triangle_\lambda$ is known to be non-displaceable by Theorem 8.1. Also, Nohara and Ueda [NU2] calculate a Floer cohomology of the Lagrangian 3-sphere $\Phi_\lambda^{-1}(0,0,0)$, which turns out to be zero over the Novikov field Λ. So it does not yield non-displaceability of the Lagrangian 3-sphere. Nevertheless, Theorem 8.4 says that it is non-displaceable.

Next, we consider a general case for an arbitrary positive integer $n \ge 4$ where λ is given as in (8.1). In this case, the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ is a reflexive polytope whose center is given by

$$(u_{i,j} := j - i : i + j \le n) \in \triangle_\lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2}.$$

Let f_m denote the face of $\triangle_\lambda$ defined by

$$\{u_{i,j} = u_{i,j+1} : 1 \le i \le m, 1 \le j \le m-1\} \cup \{u_{i+1,j} = u_{i,j} : 1 \le i \le m-1, 1 \le j \le m\}.$$

for an integer m satisfying $2 \le m \le \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Note that there are $\big(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - 1\big)$ such faces in $\triangle_\lambda$. For instance, we have two faces f_2 and f_3 for the case where $n = 7$ (see Figure 32), and three faces, f_2, f_3 and f_4 for $n = 8$ (see Figure 33). Furthermore, those faces can be filled by L-shaped blocks so that they are Lagrangian by Corollary 4.23. Regarding f_m as a polytope, the center of f_m admits a unique lattice point in its interior, whose components are given by

$$u_{i,j} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \max(i,j) \le m \\ j - i & \text{if } \max(i,j) > m. \end{cases} \tag{8.4}$$

The candidates for non-displaceable Lagrangian fibers are the fibers over the line segment $I_m \subset \triangle_\lambda$ connecting the center of $\triangle_\lambda$ and the center of f_m for each $m \ge 2$. Explicitly, the line segment I_m is parameterized by $\{I_m(t) \in \triangle_\lambda : 0 \le t \le 1\}$ where

$$I_m(t) := \begin{cases} u_{i,j}(t) = (j-i) - (j-i)\,t & \text{if } \max(i,j) \le m \\ u_{i,j}(t) = (j-i) & \text{if } \max(i,j) > m. \end{cases} \tag{8.5}$$

We denote by $L_m(t)$ the Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fiber over the point $I_m(t)$, that is $L_m(t) := \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(I_m(t))$. Now, we state our second main theorem in this section. Again its proof will be postponed to the remaining sections.

Theorem 8.6. *Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_i := n - 2i + 1 \,|\, i = 1, \cdots, n\}$ be an n-tuple of real numbers for an arbitrary integer $n \geq 4$. Consider the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$, a complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(n)$ equipped with the monotone Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form ω_λ. Then each Gelfand-Cetlin fiber $L_m(t)$ is non-displaceable Lagrangian for every $2 \leq m \leq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. In particular, there exists a family of non-displaceable non-torus Lagrangian fibers*

$$\left\{ L_m(1) : 2 \leq m \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \right\}$$

of the Gelfand-Cetlin system Φ_λ where $L_m(1)$ is diffeomorphic to $U(m) \times T^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2} - m^2}$.

Example 8.7. (1) A monotone complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(7)$ admits (at least) two line segments I_2 and I_3 in the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope over which the fibers are non-displaceable, see Figure 32. Particularly, it has non-displaceable Lagrangian $U(2) \times T^{17}$ and $U(3) \times T^{12}$.



FIGURE 32. Positions of non-displaceable Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers in $\mathcal{F}(7)$.

(2) A monotone complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(8)$ admits (at least) three line segments I_2, I_3 and I_4 in the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope over which the fibers are non-displaceable, see Figure 33. Particularly, it has non-displaceable Lagrangian $U(2) \times T^{24}$, $U(3) \times T^{19}$ and $U(4) \times T^{12}$.



FIGURE 33. Positions of non-displaceable Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin fibers in $\mathcal{F}(8)$.

9. LAGRANGIAN FLOER THEORY ON GELFAND-CETLIN SYSTEMS

The aim of this section is to review Lagrangian Floer theory which will be used to prove the results in Section 8. After briefly recalling Lagrangian Floer theory and its deformation developed by the third named author with Fukaya, Ohta, and Ono in a general context, we review work of Nishinou, Nohara, and Ueda about the calculation

of the potential function of a Gelfand-Cetlin system. Then, using the combinatorial description of Schubert cycles in complete flag manifolds by Kogan and Miller, we compute the potential function deformed by a combination of Schubert divisors.

9.1. **Potential functions of Gelfand-Cetlin systems.**

Let Λ be the Novikov field over the field $\mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers defined by

$$\Lambda := \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j T^{\lambda_j} \,\middle|\, a_j \in \mathbb{C}, \lambda_j \in \mathbb{R}, \lim_{j\to\infty} \lambda_j = \infty \right\}, \tag{9.1}$$

which is algebraically closed by Lemma A.1 in [FOOO3]. It comes with the valuation

$$\mathfrak{v}_T : \Lambda\backslash\{0\} \to \mathbb{R}, \quad \mathfrak{v}_T \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} a_j T^{\lambda_j} \right) := \inf_j \{\lambda_j : a_j \neq 0\}.$$

We also play with two subrings of Λ given by

$$\Lambda_0 := \mathfrak{v}_T^{-1}[0,\infty) \cup \{0\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda \,\middle|\, \lambda_i \geq 0 \right\}$$

$$\Lambda_+ := \mathfrak{v}_T^{-1}(0,\infty) \cup \{0\} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda \,\middle|\, \lambda_i > 0 \right\}.$$

Let Λ_U be the collection of unitary elements of Λ. That is,

$$\Lambda_U := \Lambda_0\backslash\Lambda_+ = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \in \Lambda_0 \,\middle|\, \mathfrak{v}_T \left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i T^{\lambda_i} \right) = 0 \right\}.$$

For a compact relatively spin Lagrangian submanifold L in a compact symplectic manifold (X,ω), thanks to the work of Fukaya [Fuk], one can associate a sequence of A_∞-structure maps $\{\mathfrak{m}_k\}_{k\geq 0}$ on the Λ_0-valued de Rham complex of L, which comes from moduli spaces of holomorphic discs bounded by L. Following the procedure in [FOOO2] for instance, the A_∞-algebra can be converted into the canonical model on $H^\bullet(L;\Lambda_0)$. By an abuse of notation, the structure maps of the canonical model are still denoted by $\mathfrak{m}_k$'s because the canonical model is only dealt with from now on.

A solution $b \in H^1(L;\Lambda_+)$ of the (weak) Maurer-Cartan equation

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k(b^{\otimes k}) \equiv 0 \mod \mathrm{PD}[L]$$

is said to be a *weak bounding cochain*. The value of the *potential function* $\mathfrak{PO}$ at a weak bounding cochain b is assigned to be the multiple of the Poincaré dual $\mathrm{PD}[L]$ of L. Namely,

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k(b^{\otimes k}) = \mathfrak{PO}(b) \cdot \mathrm{PD}[L].$$

Since $\mathrm{PD}[L]$ is the strict unit of the A_∞-algebra, the deformed map

$$\mathfrak{m}_1^b(h) = \sum_{l,k} \mathfrak{m}_{l+k+1}(b^{\otimes l}, h, b^{\otimes k})$$

becomes a differential and thus the Floer cohomology (deformed by b) over Λ_0 can be defined by

$$HF((L,b);\Lambda_0) := \mathrm{Ker}(\mathfrak{m}_1^b) \,/\, \mathrm{Im}(\mathfrak{m}_1^b).$$

The Floer cohomology (deformed by b) over Λ is defined by

$$HF((L,b);\Lambda) := HF((L,b);\Lambda_0) \otimes_{\Lambda_0} \Lambda.$$

The reader is referred to [FOOO1, FOOO3, FOOO4, FOOO7] for details.

Now, we specialize to the case of a Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin torus fiber $L := \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(\mathbf{u})$ in a co-adjoint orbit $X := \mathcal{O}_\lambda$. Using the degeneration of a (partial) flag manifold to the Gelfand-Cetlin toric variety (in stages) by

Kogan-Miller [KoM] in Section 6, Nishinou, Nohara, and Ueda [NNU1] construct a (not-in-stages) degeneration of the Gelfand-Cetlin system of $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ to the moment map of the Gelfand-Cetlin variety.

Theorem 9.1 (Theorem 1.2 in [NNU1]). *For any non-increasing sequence $\lambda = \{\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_n\}$, there exists a toric degeneration of the Gelfand-Cetlin system Φ_λ on the co-adjoint orbit $(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \omega_\lambda)$ in the following sense.*

(1) *There is a flat family $f\colon \mathcal{X} \to I = [0,1]$ of algebraic varieties and a symplectic form $\widetilde{\omega}$ on $\mathcal{X}$ such that*
   (a) *$X_0 := f^{-1}(0)$ is the toric variety associated to the Gelfand-Cetlin polytope $\triangle_\lambda$ and $\omega_0 := \widetilde{\omega}|_{X_0}$ is a torus-invariant Kähler form.*
   (b) *$X_1 := f^{-1}(1)$ is the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ and $\omega_1 = \widetilde{\omega}|_{X_1}$ is the Kirillov-Kostant-Souriau symplectic form ω_λ.*

(2) *There is a family $\{\Phi_t\colon X_t \to \mathbb{R}\}_{0\leq t\leq 1}$ of completely integrable systems such that Φ_0 is the moment map for the torus action on X_0 and Φ_1 is the Gelfand-Cetlin system.*

(3) *Let $\triangle_\lambda^{\mathrm{sm}} := \triangle_\lambda \backslash \Phi_0(\mathrm{Sing}(X_0))$ and $X_t^{\mathrm{sm}} := \Phi_t^{-1}(\triangle_\lambda^{\mathrm{sm}})$ where $\mathrm{Sing}(X_0)$ is the set of singular points of X_0. Then, there exists a flow ϕ_t on $\mathcal{X}$ such that for each $0 \leq t \leq s$, the restricted flow $\phi_t|_{X_s^{\mathrm{sm}}} : X_s^{\mathrm{sm}} \to X_{s-t}^{\mathrm{sm}}$ respects the symplectic structures and the complete integrable systems:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (X_s^{\mathrm{sm}}, \omega_s) & \xrightarrow{\phi_t|_{X_s^{\mathrm{sm}}}} & (X_{s-t}^{\mathrm{sm}}, \omega_{s-t}) \\ & {\scriptstyle \Phi_s} \searrow \quad \swarrow {\scriptstyle \Phi_{s-t}} & \\ & \triangle_\lambda^{\mathrm{sm}} & \end{array}$$

Let $\phi'_\epsilon : X_\epsilon \to X_0$ be a (continuous) extension of the flow $\phi_\epsilon : X_\epsilon^{\mathrm{sm}} \to X_0^{\mathrm{sm}}$ in Theorem 9.1 ([NNU1, Section 8]). The extended map ϕ'_ϵ effectively transports data for Floer theory from the toric system to a nearby integrable system as the deformation is through Fano varieties and the Gelfand-Cetlin variety admits a small resolution at the singular loci, which leads to the followings.

(1) Each Gelfand-Cetlin Lagrangian torus fiber L does not bound any non-constant holomorphic discs whose classes are of Maslov index less than or equal to 0. [NNU1, Lemma 9.20]
(2) Every class $\beta \in \pi_2(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, L)$ of Maslov index 2 is Fredholm regular. [NNU1, Proposition 9.17]

The above conditions imply that every 1-cochain in $H^1(L;\Lambda_0)$ is a weak bounding cochain and hence the potential function can be defined on $H^1(L;\Lambda_0)$. [16] Moreover, the potential function can be written as

$$\mathfrak{PO}(L;b) = \sum_\beta n_\beta \cdot \exp(\partial\beta \cap b)\, T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \tag{9.2}$$

where the summation is taken over all homotopy classes in $\pi_2(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, L)$ of Maslov index 2. Here, n_β is the open Gromov-Witten invariant of β, which counts the holomorphic discs passing through a generic point in L and representing β. Setting

$$\Gamma(n) = \{(i,j) : 2 \leq i+j \leq n\},$$

we fix the basis $\{\gamma_{i,j} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$ for $H^1(L;\mathbb{Z})$ dual to the basis for $H_1(L,\mathbb{Z})$ consisting of the unit tangent vectors generated by $\{u_{i,j} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$. Then, take the exponential variables [17]

$$y_{i,j} := e^{x_{i,j}} \tag{9.3}$$

when b is expressed as the linear combination $\sum_{(i,j)\in\Gamma(n)} x_{i,j} \cdot \gamma_{i,j}$. The potential function can be expressed as a Laurent polynomial $\mathfrak{PO}(\mathbf{y})$ with respect to $\{y_{i,j} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$.

Again by the degeneration, the classification of holomorphic discs of Maslov index 2 bounded by a Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin torus fiber is reduced to that bounded by a toric fiber, which is achieved by the third named author

[16] To extend deformation space from $H^1(L;\Lambda_+)$ to $H^1(L;\Lambda_0)$, one should consider Floer theory twisted with flat non-unitary line bundles, see Cho [Cho2].

[17] In [NNU1], Nishinou, Nohara, and Ueda set

$$y_{i,j} := e^{x_{i,j}} T^{u_{i,j}}$$

so that it is different from our $y_{i,j}$ in (9.3). To keep track of the valuations of holomorphic discs, we prefer to take $y_{i,j}$ as the expotential variable without weights.

with Cho [CO]. Specifically, Nishinou, Nohara, and Ueda show the followings in order to calculate the potential function.

(3) There is a one-to-one correspondence between the holomorphic discs of Maslov index 2 bounded by a Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin torus fiber and the facets of Gelfand-Cetlin polytope. [NNU1, Lemma 9.22]
(4) For each class β of Maslov index 2, the open Gromov-Witten invariant n_β is 1. [NNU1, Proposition 9.16]

Setting $u_{i,n+1-i} := \lambda_i$, because of Theorem 3.4, keep in mind that $\triangle_\lambda$ is defined by

$$\left\{(u_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2} : u_{i,j+1} - u_{i,j} \geq 0,\ u_{i,j} - u_{i+1,j} \geq 0 \right\}.$$

Theorem 9.2 (Theorem 10.1 in [NNU1]). *Let $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ be the co-adjoint orbit of $\lambda = \{\lambda_1 > \cdots > \lambda_n\}$, which is a complete flag manifold. Setting*

$$y_{i,n+1-i} := 1 \quad u_{i,n+1-i} := \lambda_i,$$

we consider the Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin torus L over the point $\{u_{i,j} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$. Then, the potential function on L is written as

$$\mathfrak{PO}(L;\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j)} \left(\frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} T^{u_{i,j+1}-u_{i,j}} + \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} T^{u_{i,j}-u_{i+1,j}} \right) \tag{9.4}$$

where the summation is taken over $\Gamma(n) = \{(i,j) : 2 \leq i+j \leq n\}$.

Remark 9.3. In [NNU2], Nishinou, Nohara, and Ueda indeed calculate the potential function in a more general context. In this article, we focus only on co-adjoint orbits that are diffeomorphic to complete flag manifolds.

For a real number t with $0 \leq t < 1$, the potential function of the Lagrangian torus $L_m(t)$ over $I_m(t)$ is arranged as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{PO}(L_m(t);\mathbf{y}) = &\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} + \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(\sum_{\max(i,j) \geq m+1} \left(\frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} + \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} \right) \right) T^1 \\ &+ \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{y_{m-i,m+1}}{y_{m-i,m}} + \frac{y_{m,m-i}}{y_{m+1,m-i}} \right) T^{1+it} \right) \end{aligned} \tag{9.5}$$

For simplicity, we frequently omit $L_m(t)$ in $\mathfrak{PO}(L_m(t);\mathbf{y})$ if $L_m(t)$ is clear in the context. The logarithmic derivative with respect to $y_{i,j}$ is denoted by

$$\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) := y_{i,j} \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}}{\partial y_{i,j}}. \tag{9.6}$$

Example 9.4. In the complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(5) \simeq \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ where $\lambda = \{4,2,0,-2,-4\}$, some logarithmic derivatives of $\mathfrak{PO}(L_2(t);\mathbf{y})$ are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \partial(1,1)(\mathbf{y}) &= \left(-\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} \right) T^{1-t}, \\ \partial(2,2)(\mathbf{y}) &= \left(-\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{2,2}} + \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{2,1}} \right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{y_{2,3}}{y_{2,2}} + \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{3,2}} \right) T^1, \\ \partial(2,3)(\mathbf{y}) &= \left(-\frac{1}{y_{2,3}} - \frac{y_{1,3}}{y_{2,3}} + y_{2,3} + \frac{y_{2,3}}{y_{2,2}} \right) T^1. \end{aligned}$$

9.2. **Bulk-deformations by Schubert cycles.**

We will apply Lagrangian Floer theory deformed by cycles of an ambient symplectic manifold, developed by the third named author with Fukaya, Ohta and Ono in [FOOO1, FOOO4, FOOO7], in order to show non-displaceability. For a Lagrangian torus L from Section 9.1, we deform the underlying A_∞-algebra by considering moduli spaces

of holomorphic discs with interior marked points passing through the designated cycles at the image. Taking a combination of divisors $\mathscr{D}_j$ not intersecting L

$$\mathfrak{b} := \sum_{j=1}^{B} \mathfrak{b}_j \cdot \mathscr{D}_j,$$

the potential function can be deformed. We call $\mathfrak{b}$ a *bulk-deformation parameter*.

Remark 9.5. For the purpose of the present paper, we use only divisor classes to deform Lagrangian Floer theory because the deformed potential function is computable. It also simplifies construction of virtual fundamental cycles needed for the definition of open Gromov-Witten invariants [FOOO4, Definition 6.7], denoted by $n_\beta(\mathbf{p})$.

We first recall the formula for the potential function deformed by a combination of toric divisors $\mathscr{D}_j$

$$\mathfrak{b} := \sum_{j=1}^{B} \mathfrak{b}_j \cdot \mathscr{D}_j,$$

in a compact toric manifold X from [FOOO4].

Theorem 9.6 ([FOOO4])**.** *The bulk-deformed potential function, also called the potential function with bulk, is written as*

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}(L;b) = \sum_{\beta} n_\beta \cdot \exp\left(\sum_{j=1}^{B} (\beta \cap \mathscr{D}_j)\, \mathfrak{b}_j\right) \exp(\partial\beta \cap b)\, T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi}. \tag{9.7}$$

where the summantion is taken over all homotopy classes in $\pi_2(X, L)$ of Maslov index 2.

In the derivation of this in [FOOO4], the properties that the relevant bulk cycles are smooth and T^n-invariant are used. Since our Schubert divisors are neither T^n-invariant nor smooth in general. Because of this, we will provide details of the proof of this theorem for the current Gelfand-Cetlin case modifying the arguments used in the proof of [FOOO4, Proposition 4.7] similarly as done in [NNU1, Section 9], see Appendix A. The upshot is that we still have the same formula for the potential function with bulk in the current Gelfand-Cetlin case, see (A.10).

Again by taking the system of exponential coordinates in (9.3), $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ in (A.10) becomes a Laurent series with respect to $\{y_{i,j} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$.

Theorem 9.7 ([FOOO4])**.** *If the bulk-deformed potential function $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}(L;\mathbf{y})$ admits a critical point $\mathbf{y}$ whose components are in Λ_U, then L is non-displaceable.*

In our case, we employ Schubert divisors to deform the potential function $\mathfrak{PO}$ in Section 9.1. In his thesis [Ko], Kogan expresses the Schubert cycles as certain unions of the inverse images of faces in the Gelfand-Cetlin system of a complete flag manifold. Soon after, Kogan and Miller [KoM] realize the toric degeneration of a flag manifold given by Gonciulea-Lakshmibai [GL] as a deformation of the action of the lower triangular matrices on the space of matrices (of a fixed size). It defines a Gröbner degeneration as shown in Knutson-Miller [KnM], which induces degenerations on subvarieties. Furthermore, Kogan and Miller develop a combinatorial method determining a union of toric subvarieties given by faces of a Gelfand-Cetlin polytope which a given Schubert variety degenerates into.

We review their results in terms of ladder diagrams. A facet in a Gelfand-Cetlin polytope is said to be *horizontal* (resp. *vertical*) if it is given by $u_{i,j} = u_{i+1,j}$ (resp. $u_{i,j+1} = u_{i,j}$). Let $P^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1}$ (resp. $P^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j}$) be the union of horizontal (resp. vertical) facets between the i-th column and the $(i+1)$-th column (resp. the $(j+1)$-th row and the j-th row) of the ladder diagram. That is,

$$P^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} := \bigcup_{s=1}^{n-i} \{u_{i,s} = u_{i+1,s}\}, \quad P^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} := \bigcup_{r=1}^{n-j} \{u_{r,j+1} = u_{r,j}\}$$

for $1 \le i, j \le n-1$ where $\{u_{\bullet,\bullet} = u_{\bullet,\bullet}\}$ denotes the facet given by the equation inside.

Example 9.8. We consider the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \simeq \mathcal{F}(6)$ where $\lambda = (5, 3, 1, -1, -3, -5)$.

(1) $P^{\mathrm{hor}}_{4,5}$ is the union of two horizontal facets

$$P^{\mathrm{hor}}_{4,5} = \{u_{4,2} = -3\} \cup \{u_{4,1} = u_{5,1}\}$$

as in Figure 34.

(2) $P^{\mathrm{ver}}_{4,3}$ is the union of three vertical facets

$$P^{\mathrm{ver}}_{4,3} = \{1 = u_{3,3}\} \cup \{u_{2,4} = u_{2,3}\} \cup \{u_{1,4} = u_{1,3}\}$$

as in Figure 35.



FIGURE 34. $P^{\mathrm{hor}}_{4,5}$ in $\mathcal{F}(6)$.



FIGURE 35. $P^{\mathrm{ver}}_{4,3}$ in $\mathcal{F}(6)$.

Theorem 9.9 (Theorem 8 and Remark 10 in [KoM])**.** *An (opposite) Schubert divisor degenerates into a union of toric divisors corresponding to $P^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}$ or to $P^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$ in the Gelfand-Cetlin toric variety. Indeed, the degeneration gives rise to a one-to-one correspondence between the set of Schubert or opposite Schubert divisors and the set of unions of toric divisors corresponding to $P^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}$ or to $P^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$.*

Proof. By following the combinatorial process playing with *reduced pipe dreams* in [KoM], observe that the Schubert varieties associated to the adjacent transpositions [18] are corresponding to either horizontal or vertical Schubert divisors. The others are obtained by applying the involution to them. □

Definition 9.10. The Schubert divisor or opposite Schubert divisor degenerated into the union of toric divisors over $P^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}$ (resp. $P^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$) is said to be *horizontal* (resp. *vertical*) and is denoted by $\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}$ (resp. $\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$).

Since horizontal and vertical Schubert divisors do *not* intersect any Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin tori, we can apply (A.10) to calculate the bulk-deformed potential function. Because of the condition (3) in Section 9.1, let

$$\beta^{i,j}_{i+1,j} \quad \left(\text{resp. } \beta^{i,j+1}_{i,j}\right)$$

be the homotopy class in $\pi_2(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, L)$ represented by a holomorphic disc of Maslov index 2 corresponding to $u_{i,j} = u_{i+1,j}$ (resp. $u_{i,j+1} = u_{i,j}$).

Lemma 9.11. *Let $\mathscr{D}$ be either a horizontal or a vertical Schubert divisor. Then, we have*

$$\beta^{i,j}_{i+1,j} \cap \mathscr{D} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathscr{D} = \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \qquad \beta^{i,j+1}_{i,j} \cap \mathscr{D} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mathscr{D} = \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

[18] An adjacent transposition is a transposition of the form $(i, i+1)$.

Proof. Let $\phi'_\epsilon\colon X_\epsilon \to X_0$ be a (continuous) extension of the flow $\phi_\epsilon\colon X_\epsilon^{\mathrm{sm}} \to X_0^{\mathrm{sm}}$ in Theorem 9.1, see [NNU1, Section 8]. Let $\varphi\colon (\mathbb{D}, \partial\mathbb{D}) \to (X_\epsilon, L_\epsilon)$ be a holomorphic disc representing $\beta^{i,j}_{i+1,j}$ of Maslov index 2 for example. Then, we have a (topological) disc $\phi'_\epsilon \circ \varphi\colon (\mathbb{D}, \partial\mathbb{D}) \to (X_\epsilon, L_\epsilon) \to (X_0, L_0)$, which represents $(\phi'_\epsilon)_*\beta^{i,j}_{i+1,j}$. Note that there exists a holomorphic disc φ_0 by [CO] representing the class $(\phi'_\epsilon)_*\beta^{i,j}_{i+1,j} = [\phi'_\epsilon \circ \varphi]$. Meanwhile, by our choice of $\mathscr{D}$, it degenerates into the union of components of the toric divisors over either $P^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}$ or $P^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$. Since the flow ϕ'_ϵ gives rise to a symplectomorphism from X_ϵ^{sm} to X_0^{sm} and the image of the disc φ is contained in X_ϵ^{sm}, the (local) intersection number should be preserved through the flow ϕ'_ϵ. To calculate the intersection number, we consider a small resolution $p\colon \widetilde{X}_0 \to X_0$. Because the intersection happens only outside the singular loci at X_0, we can lift the divisor and the disc φ_0 to $\widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_0$ and $\widetilde{\varphi}_0$ in $\widetilde{X}_0$ without any change of the intersection number. Then, we have

$$\beta^{i,j}_{i+1,j} \cap \mathscr{D} = [\varphi] \cap \mathscr{D} = [\widetilde{\varphi}_0] \cap \widetilde{\mathscr{D}}_0,$$

which completes the proof. □

We take

$$\mathfrak{b} := \sum_i \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} \cdot \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} + \sum_j \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j} \cdot \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j} \tag{9.8}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j} \in \Lambda_0$. By (A.10) and Lemma 9.11, the potential function can be written as follow.

Corollary 9.12. *Taking a bulk-deformation parameter as in (9.8), the deformed potential function is expressed as*

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}(L; \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{(i,j)} \left(\exp\left(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}\right) \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} T^{u_{i,j}-u_{i+1,j}} + \exp\left(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}\right) \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} T^{u_{i,j+1}-u_{i,j}} \right). \tag{9.9}$$

Note that the gradient of the bulk-deformed potential is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) := y_{i,j} \frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_{i,j}}(\mathbf{y}) = &-c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j} \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} T^{u_{i,j+1}-u_{i,j}} - c^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i-1,i} \frac{y_{i-1,j}}{y_{i,j}} T^{u_{i-1,j}-u_{i,j}} \\ &+ c^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} T^{u_{i,j}-u_{i+1,j}} + c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j,j-1} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i,j-1}} T^{u_{i,j}-u_{i,j-1}} \end{aligned} \tag{9.10}$$

where $c^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} = \exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1})$ and $c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j} = \exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j})$.

9.3. **Proof of Theorem 8.4.**

In this section, we prove Theorem 8.4. Before starting our proof, we prove the following proposition.

Proposition 9.13. *Let $\Phi\colon X \to \Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a completely integrable system (Definition 2.5) such that Φ is proper. If there exists a sequence $\{\mathbf{u}_i : i \in \mathbb{N}\}$ such that*

1. *Each $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i)$ is non-displaceable.*
2. *The sequence $\mathbf{u}_i$ converges to some point $\mathbf{u}_\infty$ in Δ.*

then $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_\infty)$ is also non-displaceable.

Proof. For a contradiction, suppose that $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_\infty)$ is displaceable. There is a (time-dependent) Hamiltonian diffeomorphism ϕ and an open set U containing $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_\infty)$ in X such that

$$\phi(U) \cap U = \emptyset.$$

For each i, there exists a point $x_i \in \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i)$ such that $x_i \notin U$ since $\Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_i)$ is non-displaceable. It implies that any subsequence of $\{x_i\}$ cannot converge to a point in U. On the other hand, passing to a subsequence, we may assume that x_i converges to x_∞ for some $x_\infty \in X$ since Φ is proper. By the continuity of Φ, we then have

$$\mathbf{u}_\infty = \lim_{i\to\infty} \mathbf{u}_i = \lim_{i\to\infty} \Phi(x_i) = \Phi(x_\infty).$$

It leads to a contradiction that $x_\infty \in \Phi^{-1}(\mathbf{u}_\infty) \subset U$. □

Proof of Theorem 8.4. The potential function over I of (8.3) is arranged as

$$\mathfrak{PO}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} + y_{1,2} + \frac{1}{y_{2,1}}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(\frac{1}{y_{1,2}} + y_{2,1}\right) T^{1+t}.$$

We start with a *tentative* bulk-parameter $\mathfrak{b}' := \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{2,1} \cdot \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{2,1}$ such that $\exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{2,1}) = 1 + T^{2t}$, i.e.,

$$\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{2,1} = T^{2t} - \frac{1}{2}T^{4t} + \cdots.$$

By Corollary 9.12, the potential function is deformed into

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}'}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} + y_{1,2} + \frac{1}{y_{2,1}}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{1}{y_{2,1}} + \frac{1}{y_{1,2}} + y_{2,1}\right) T^{1+t},$$

whose logarithmic derivatives are

$$\begin{cases} y_{1,1}\dfrac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}'}}{\partial y_{1,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\dfrac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \dfrac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\dfrac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}}\right) T^{1+t} \\ y_{1,2}\dfrac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}'}}{\partial y_{1,2}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(\dfrac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + y_{1,2}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(\dfrac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} - \dfrac{1}{y_{1,2}}\right) T^{1+t} \\ y_{2,1}\dfrac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}'}}{\partial y_{2,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\dfrac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} - \dfrac{1}{y_{2,1}}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\dfrac{1}{y_{2,1}} + y_{2,1}\right) T^{1+t}. \end{cases}$$

We set $y_{1,2} = 1, y_{2,1} = 1$ and take $y_{1,1}$ as the solution of $(y_{1,1})^2 = 1 + T^{2t}$ satisfying $y_{1,1} \equiv -1 \mod T^{>0}$. It is easy to see that $y_{1,1}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}'}}{\partial y_{1,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$. Note that $y_{1,1}$ is of the form

$$y_{1,1} \equiv -1 - \frac{1}{2}T^{2t} \mod T^{>2t}.$$

We now adjust a bulk-deformation parameter from $\mathfrak{b}'$ to $\mathfrak{b}$ in order for the chosen $(y_{1,1}, y_{1,2}, y_{2,1})$ to be a critical point of $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}$. Let

$$\mathfrak{b} := \mathfrak{b}' + \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{3,2} \cdot \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{3,2} + \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{2,3} \cdot \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{2,3}.$$

Since $\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{3,2}$ and $\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{2,3}$ do not intersect with the homotopy classes corresponding to $\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{2,1}$ in $\pi_2(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, \Phi_\lambda^{-1}(t))$, we have

$$y_{1,1}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_{1,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = y_{1,1}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}'}}{\partial y_{1,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0.$$

Plugging the chosen $y_{i,j}$'s, we have

$$\begin{cases} y_{1,2}\dfrac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_{1,2}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\dfrac{1}{2} - \exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{3,2})\right) T^{1+t} + \mathfrak{P}^{(1,2)} \cdot T^{1+t} \\ y_{2,1}\dfrac{\partial \mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}}{\partial y_{2,1}}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\dfrac{1}{2} + \exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{2,3})\right) T^{1+t} + \mathfrak{P}^{(2,1)} \cdot T^{1+t}. \end{cases}$$

for some constant $\mathfrak{P}^{(1,2)}, \mathfrak{P}^{(2,1)} \in \Lambda_+$. By choosing $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{3,2}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{2,3} \in \Lambda_0$ so that

$$\begin{cases} \exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{3,2}) = -\dfrac{1}{2} + \mathfrak{B}^{(1,2)} \\ \exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{2,3}) = \dfrac{1}{2} - \mathfrak{B}^{(2,1)}. \end{cases}$$

we can make $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{y})$ admit a critical point. By Theorem 9.7, each torus fiber over the line segment

$$\left\{(u_{1,1}, u_{1,2}, u_{2,1}) = (0, 1-t, -1+t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid 0 \le t < 1\right\}$$

is non-displaceable. Furthermore, Proposition 9.13 yields non-displaceability of the Lagrangain 3-sphere. □

10. Decompositions of the gradient of potential function

In this section, in order to prove Theorem 8.6, we introduce the split leading term equation of the potential function in (9.5), which is the analogue of the leading term equation in [FOOO3, FOOO4]. We discuss relation between its solvability and non-triviality of Floer cohomology under a certain bulk-deformation.

10.1. Outline of Section 10 and Section 11.

Due to Theorem 9.7, in order to show that the Gelfand-Cetlin torus fiber $L_m(t)$ for each t with $0 \leq t < 1$ is non-displaceable, it suffices to find a bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}$ so that $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ admits a critical point $\mathbf{y}$. Section 10 and Section 11 will be occupied to discuss how to determine them.

Before giving the outline, we explain why this process takes so long by pointing out contrasts with the case of toric fibers in a symplectic toric manifold. In the toric case, the (generalized) leading term equation is introduced so as to detect non-displaceable toric fibers effectively in [FOOO4, Section 11]. Roughly speaking, it is the initial terms of the gradient of a (bulk-deformed) potential function with respect to a suitable choice of exponential variables. It is proven therein that there always exists a bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}$ so that the complex solution becomes a critical point of the bulk-deformed potential function $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ as soon as the leading term equation admits a solution whose components are in $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$. Indeed, the positions where the leading term equation is solvable are characterized by the intersection of certain tropicalizations in [KL]. The key features for proving the above statements are in order. First, there is a one-to-one correspondence between the *honest* holomorphic discs bounded by a toric fiber of Maslov index 2 and the facets of the moment polytope. Second, the preimage of each facet represents a cycle of degree 2. Therefore, all terms corresponding to the facets can be independently controlled, yielding a parameter $\mathfrak{b}$ and providing a solution of the equation.

In a Gelfand-Cetlin system, however, the inverse image of a facet may not represent a cycle of degree 2 so that the terms of $\mathfrak{PO}$ cannot be independently controlled. [19] Thus, the above statements are not expected to hold anymore. But for a family of Lagrangian tori $L_m(t)$ in $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \simeq \mathcal{F}(n)$ with the monotone symplectic form ω_λ, we will show the existence of a bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}$ and a critical point $\mathbf{y}$. In Section 10, we define the *split leading term equation* (See Definition 10.3), which replaces the role of the leading term equation in the toric case. We then demonstrate how to determine a bulk-deformation parameter and extend a solution of the split leading term equation to a critical point of the bulk-deformed potential function. In Section 11, we show that the split leading term equation always admits a solution. In general, finding a solution of a general system of multi-variable equations is not simple at all even with the aid of a computer. Yet, in this case, we are able to find a solution, guided by ladder diagrams regarding as the containers of exponential variables.

Let $B(m)$ be the sub-diagram consisting of $(m \times m)$ lower-left unit boxes in the ladder diagram $\Gamma(n) := \Gamma(1, \cdots, n)$ of $\mathcal{F}(n)$. The diagrams $\Gamma(n)$ and $B(m)$ are often regarded as collections of double indices as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(n) &= \{(i,j) : 2 \leq i+j \leq n\} \\ B(m) &= \{(i,j) : 1 \leq i,j \leq m\}. \end{aligned} \tag{10.1}$$

Recalling (9.5), the potential function of $L_m(t)$ is arranged as several groups with repsect to the energy levels. Observe that the valuation of $\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y})$ for $(i,j) \in B(m)$ is $(1-t)$ and that of $\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y})$ for $(i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(m)$ is 1.

We will decompose the gradient of the potential function deformed by $\mathfrak{b}$ in (9.8) into two pieces along the boundary of $B(m)$. We are planning to determine a critical point in the following steps.

(1) Find a solution $y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ of the system consisting of the equations $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) \equiv 0 \mod T^{>1}$ in $\Gamma(n)\backslash B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\}$ and equations relating the variables adjacent to $B(m)$ in Section 11.
(2) Find a solution $y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ of $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) \equiv 0 \mod T^{>1-t}$ in $B(m)$ in Section 10.3.
(3) Determine a solution $y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U$ of $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in $B(m)$ such that $y_{i,j} \equiv y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \mod T^{>0}$ in Section 10.4.

[19] Because of this feature, Bernstein-Kushnirenko theorem [Be, Ku] cannot be applied in our situation.

(4) Determine a solution $y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U$ of $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in $\Gamma(n)\backslash B(m)$ such that $y_{i,j} \equiv y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \mod T^{>0}$ in Section 10.5.

The *split leading term equation* (See Definition 10.3) arises in the first step (1). In this section, assuming that the split leading term equation is solvable, we explain how to complete the remaing steps (2), (3) and (4). The next section focuses on solving the split leading term equation.

Example 10.1. In the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ of a sequence $\lambda = \{5,3,1,-1,-3,-5\}$ for instance, the potential function of $L_2(t)$ is arranged as follows:

$$\mathfrak{PO}(L_2(t);\mathbf{y}) = \left(\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} + \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{2,2}} + \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{2,1}}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(\frac{y_{1,4}}{y_{1,3}} + \frac{y_{1,3}}{y_{2,3}} + \cdots\right) T^1 + \left(\frac{y_{1,3}}{y_{1,2}} + \frac{y_{2,1}}{y_{3,1}}\right) T^{1+t}.$$

In this example, the valuation of partial derivatives of $\mathfrak{PO}$ jumps along the red line in Figure 36.

Turning on bulk-deformation, according to (9.10), A complex number $y_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ has to satisfy

$$\begin{cases} -c_{2,1}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} = 0, \ c_{2,1}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{1,1}} + c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{2,2}} = 0, \\ -c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,1}}{y_{2,1}} - c_{2,1}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{2,1}} = 0, \ -c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{2,2}} + c_{2,1}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{2,1}} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{10.2}$$

which comes from the initial parts of the partial derivatives inside $B(2)$, and

$$\begin{cases} -c_{6,5}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{1}{y_{1,5}} + c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot y_{1,5} + c_{5,4}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,5}}{y_{1,4}} = 0, \ -c_{5,4}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{1}{y_{2,4}} - c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,4}}{y_{2,4}} + c_{2,3}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot y_{2,4} + c_{4,3}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,4}}{y_{2,3}} = 0, \cdots \\ -c_{5,4}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,5}}{y_{1,4}} + c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,4}}{y_{2,4}} + c_{4,3}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,4}}{y_{1,3}} = 0, \ -c_{4,3}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,4}}{y_{2,3}} - c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,3}}{y_{2,3}} + c_{2,3}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,3}}{y_{3,3}} + c_{3,2}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,3}}{y_{2,2}} = 0, \cdots \\ -c_{4,3}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,4}}{y_{1,3}} + c_{1,2}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{1,3}}{y_{2,3}} = 0, \ -c_{3,2}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,3}}{y_{2,2}} + c_{2,3}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{3,2}} = 0, \ -c_{2,1}^{\mathrm{ver}} \cdot \frac{y_{3,2}}{y_{3,1}} + c_{3,4}^{\mathrm{hor}} \cdot \frac{y_{3,1}}{y_{4,1}} = 0, \end{cases} \tag{10.3}$$

which comes from the initial parts of the partial derivatives inside $\Gamma(6)\backslash B(2) \cup \{(2,2)\}$, see Figure 36. Solving the first system (10.2) is related to the step (2) and solving the second system (10.3) is related to the step (1).



FIGURE 36. Decomposition of the gradient of the potential function in $\mathcal{F}(6)$.

Remark 10.2. More generally, one might consider the fibers over the line segment connecting the center of $\triangle_\lambda$ and the center of another Lagrangian face γ. Depending on γ in the ladder diagram $\Gamma(n)$ in some cases, one might decompose the potential function into several pieces along the simply connected regions that are not unit-sized blocks. The reader is referred to [CKO] in order to consult a geometric interpretation and implication of the potential function *inside* the decomposed blocks. Also, it is discussed therein when the potential function has a critical point.

The split leading term equation would be formed by the system from the outside of the decomposed blocks, providing the complex part of a critical point with a suitable choice of a complex solution within the decomposed blocks. This intuition motivates us to name it the "split" leading term equation. In this article, the general form will not be discussed as the split leading term equation from $I_m(t)$ in (8.5) is only dealt with.

10.2. **Split leading term equation.**

We now define the split leading term equation arising from the potential function of $L_m(t)$. In this case, it suffices to take a bulk-deformation parameter

$$\mathfrak{b} := \sum_{i\geq k} \mathfrak{b}^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} \cdot \mathscr{D}^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} + \sum_{j\geq k} \mathfrak{b}^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} \cdot \mathscr{D}^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} \tag{10.4}$$

instead of the form (9.8). Therefore, we should set

$$\begin{cases} c^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} := \exp\left(\mathfrak{b}^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} = 0\right) = 1 \quad \text{for } i < k, \\ c^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} := \exp\left(\mathfrak{b}^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} = 0\right) = 1 \quad \text{for } j < k. \end{cases}$$

In particular, we see that $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)$ in (9.10) coincides with $\partial(i,j)$ in (9.6) for all $1 \leq i,j < k$.

Definition 10.3. Let $k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$, that is $n = 2k-1$ or $2k$. We set

$$\begin{cases} c^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} := 1 \quad \text{for } i < k, \quad c^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} := 1 \quad \text{for } j < k \\ y_{i,m} := \infty \quad \text{for } i < m, \quad y_{m,j} := 0 \quad \text{for } j < m \\ y_{\bullet,0} := \infty, \ y_{0,\bullet} := 0, \ y_{i,n+1-i} := 1 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n \end{cases} \tag{10.5}$$

The *split leading term equation of* $\Gamma(n)$ *associated to* $B(m)$ is the system of the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \\ \partial_m(l)(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{10.6}$$

for all $(i,j) \in \Gamma(n) \backslash B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\}$ and all l with $1 \leq l < m$. Here,

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) := -c^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} - c^{\text{hor}}_{i-1,i} \cdot \frac{y_{i-1,j}}{y_{i,j}} + c^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} + c^{\text{ver}}_{j,j-1} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i,j-1}} \tag{10.7}$$

$$\partial_m(l)(\mathbf{y}) := (-1)^{m+1-l} \cdot \frac{y_{l,m+1}}{y_{m,m}} + \frac{y_{m,m}}{y_{m+1,l}}, \tag{10.8}$$

and $c^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1}$'s and $c^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j}$'s for $i,j \geq k$ are non-zero complex numbers.

We explain how the split leading term equation of $\Gamma(n)$ associated to $B(m)$ can be written. Cutting the boxes $B(m)\backslash\{(m,m)\}$ off from the diagram $\Gamma(n)$, (10.7) comes from $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y})$ for (i,j)'s on the cut diagram as explained in (10.3) for the case $\mathcal{F}(6)$. In addition to them, we impose (10.8) to relate the variables adjacent to $B(m)$. It will be explained in (10.23) and (10.27) why (10.8) appears.

Remark 10.4. Furthermore, we may take $\mathfrak{b}^{\text{hor}}_{k,k+1} = 0$ so that $c^{\text{hor}}_{k,k+1} = 1$ if $n = 2k$. See Remark 10.18 to see why.

Example 10.5. The split leading term equation of $\Gamma(5)$ associated to $B(2)$ consists of

$$\begin{cases} -c^{\text{ver}}_{5,4} \cdot \dfrac{1}{y_{1,4}} + y_{1,4} + c^{\text{ver}}_{4,3} \cdot \dfrac{y_{1,4}}{y_{1,3}} = 0, \ -c^{\text{ver}}_{4,3} \cdot \dfrac{1}{y_{2,3}} - \dfrac{y_{1,3}}{y_{2,3}} + y_{2,3} + \dfrac{y_{2,3}}{y_{2,2}} = 0, \\ -\dfrac{1}{y_{3,2}} - \dfrac{y_{2,2}}{y_{3,2}} + c^{\text{hor}}_{3,4} \cdot y_{3,2} + \dfrac{y_{3,2}}{y_{3,1}} = 0, -\dfrac{1}{y_{4,1}} - c^{\text{hor}}_{3,4} \cdot \dfrac{y_{3,1}}{y_{4,1}} + c^{\text{hor}}_{4,5} \cdot y_{4,1} = 0, \\ -c^{\text{ver}}_{4,3} \cdot \dfrac{y_{1,4}}{y_{1,3}} + \dfrac{y_{1,3}}{y_{2,3}} = 0, \ -\dfrac{y_{3,2}}{y_{3,1}} + c^{\text{hor}}_{3,4} \cdot \dfrac{y_{3,1}}{y_{4,1}} = 0, \ -\dfrac{y_{2,3}}{y_{2,2}} + \dfrac{y_{2,2}}{y_{3,2}} = 0, \ \dfrac{y_{1,3}}{y_{2,2}} + \dfrac{y_{2,2}}{y_{3,1}} = 0. \end{cases}$$

Remark 10.6. We would like to address that the split leading term equation is *not* same as the initial part of the gradient of the potential function. Note that $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(2,2) = 0$ is of the form

$$\left(-\frac{y_{1,2}}{y_{2,2}} + \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{2,1}}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{y_{2,3}}{y_{2,2}} + \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{3,2}}\right) T^1 = 0.$$

Its initial part will be used to obtain a critical point of the potential function within $B(2)$ in Section 10.3. As we have seen in Example 10.5, the split leading term equation captures the terms with the second energy level

$$-\frac{y_{2,3}}{y_{2,2}} + \frac{y_{2,2}}{y_{3,2}} = 0$$

as well.

The main theorem of this section is as follows.

Theorem 10.7. *Let $\lambda = \{\lambda_i := n - 2i + 1 : i = 1, \cdots, n\}$ be an n-tuple of real numbers for an arbitrary integer $n \geq 4$. Consider the co-adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$, a complete flag manifold $\mathcal{F}(n)$ equipped with the monotone form ω_λ. Fix one Lagrangian Gelfand-Cetlin torus $L_m(t)$ over $I_m(t)$ for $0 \leq t < 1$ in $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. If the split leading term equation (10.6) admits a solution $\{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\}\}$ each component of which is a non-zero complex number for some nonzero complex numbers $c_{i,i+1}^{\mathrm{hor},\mathbb{C}}$'s and $c_{j+1,j}^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}$'s $(i,j \geq k)$, then there exists a bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}$ (depending on m and t) of the form (9.8) such that*

(1) *The bulk-deformed potential function $\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mathbf{y})$ has a critical point $\{y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\}$ satisfying*

$$y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \equiv y_{i,j} \mod T^{>0} \quad \text{for } (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\}.$$

(2) *Also, $c_{i,i+1}^{\mathrm{hor},\mathbb{C}} \equiv \exp(\mathfrak{b}_{i,i+1}^{\mathrm{hor}})$, $c_{j+1,j}^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}} \equiv \exp(\mathfrak{b}_{j+1,j}^{\mathrm{ver}}) \mod T^{>0}$.*

The existence of a solution for the split leading term equation (10.6) implies that the assumption of the following lemma is satisfied. We will repeatedly employ it in order to extend a solution in $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ to that in Λ_U of the gradient of the (bulk-deformed) potential function.

Lemma 10.8. *Let $c_{j+1,j}, c_{i-1,i}, c_{i,i+1}$ and $c_{j,j-1}$ be elements in Λ_U. Suppose that we are given $y_{i-1,j} \in \Lambda_U \cup \{0\}$, $y_{i,j-1} \in \Lambda_U \cup \{\infty\}$ and $y_{i+1,j}, y_{i,j}$ (resp. $y_{i,j}, y_{i,j+1}$) $\in \Lambda_U$. If there is a* non-zero *complex solution $y_{i,j+1}^{\mathbb{C}}$ (resp. $y_{i+1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}$) for*

$$-c_{j+1,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j+1}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} - c_{i-1,i}^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot \frac{y_{i-1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} + c_{i,i+1}^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i+1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}} + c_{j,j-1}^{\mathbb{C}} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}}{y_{i,j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}} = 0, \tag{10.9}$$

then there exists a unique element $y_{i,j+1}$ (resp. $y_{i+1,j}$) $\in \Lambda_U$ that solves

$$-c_{j+1,j} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} - c_{i-1,i} \cdot \frac{y_{i-1,j}}{y_{i,j}} + c_{i,i+1} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} + c_{j,j-1} \cdot \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i,j-1}} = 0. \tag{10.10}$$

Here, for $y \in \Lambda_U$, $y^{\mathbb{C}}$ denotes a unique complex number such that $y^{\mathbb{C}} \equiv y \mod T^{>0}$.

Furthermore, assume in addition that $c_{\bullet,\bullet}$'s are non-zero complex numbers and

$$\mathfrak{v}_T\left(y_{i,j} - y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}\right) > \lambda, \mathfrak{v}_T\left(y_{i-1,j} - y_{i-1,j}^{\mathbb{C}}\right) > \lambda \text{ and } \mathfrak{v}_T\left(y_{i,j-1} - y_{i,j-1}^{\mathbb{C}}\right) > \lambda.$$

Then, $\mathfrak{v}_T(y_{i+1,j}) = \lambda$ if and only if $\mathfrak{v}_T(y_{i,j+1}) = \lambda$.

Proof. The proof immediately follows from the observation that $y_{i+1,j}$ (or $y_{i,j+1}$) in (10.10) can be expressed as a rational function in terms of the other variables. □



FIGURE 37. Graphical description of Lemma 10.8.

10.3. **Symmetric complex solutions within $B(m)$.**

In this section, we focus on the system of equations

$$\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) := y_{i,j}\frac{\partial \mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{D}}{\partial y_{i,j}}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for all } (i,j) \in B(m) \tag{10.11}$$

within $B(m)$. For an index $(i,j) \in B(m)$, ignoring the variables outside of $B(m)$, the initial part of $\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y})$ is denoted by $\partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y})$. By (9.5), we obtain

$$\partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{y_{i,j+1}}{y_{i,j}} - \frac{y_{i-1,j}}{y_{i,j}} + \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i+1,j}} + \frac{y_{i,j}}{y_{i,j-1}} \tag{10.12}$$

where $y_{0,\bullet}, y_{\bullet,m+1,}, y_{\bullet,0}$ and $y_{m+1,\bullet}$ are respectively set to be $0, 0, \infty$ and ∞. The goal of the section is to find a "symmetric" complex solution for (10.12), see Proposition 10.11.

Lemma 10.9. *Let c be a non-zero complex number. If there is a solution $\{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} : (i,j) \in B(m)\}$ of the system of equations*

$$\partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \textit{for } (i,j) \in B(m), \tag{10.13}$$

then

$$\widetilde{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}} := c \cdot y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} \quad \textit{for } (i,j) \in B(m)$$

also forms a solution of (10.13).

Proof. It follows from $\partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = \partial_m(i,j)(c \cdot \mathbf{y})$. □

Lemma 10.10. *There exists a solution $\{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} : i+j \leq m+1\}$ of the system of equations*

$$\partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \textit{for } i+j \leq m \tag{10.14}$$

such that

$$y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} = (y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,i})^{-1}. \tag{10.15}$$

Proof. We claim that

$$y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = j \\ \displaystyle\prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r) & \text{for } i < j \\ \displaystyle\prod_{r=0}^{i-j-1} (2j+2r)^{-1} & \text{for } i > j \end{cases} \tag{10.16}$$

forms a solution for (10.14) satisfying (10.15).

For the case where $i < j$, we see

$$y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} = \prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r) = \left(\prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r)^{-1}\right)^{-1} = \left(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,i}\right)^{-1}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) &= -\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j+1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i-1,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,j}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j-1}} \\ &= -\frac{\prod_{r=0}^{j-i}(2i+2r)}{\prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1}(2i+2r)} - \frac{\prod_{r=0}^{j-i}(2(i-1)+2r)}{\prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1}(2i+2r)} + \frac{\prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1}(2i+2r)}{\prod_{r=0}^{j-i-2}(2(i+1)+2r)} + \frac{\prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1}(2i+2r)}{\prod_{r=0}^{j-i-2}(2i+2r)} \\ &= -2j - (2i-2) + 2i + (2j-2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

The case for $i > j$ follows from $\partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = -\partial_m(j,i)(\mathbf{y})$. When $i = j$,

$$\partial_m(i,i)(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i+1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i-1,i}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,i}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i-1}} = -y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i+1} - y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i-1,i} + \frac{1}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,i}} + \frac{1}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i-1}} = 0.$$

□

We are ready to prove the existence of a symmetric solution in the sense of (10.15).

Proposition 10.11. *There exists a solution* $\{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} : (i,j) \in B(m)\}$ *of the system* (10.13) *of equations such that* (10.15) *holds for* $(i,j) \in B(m)$.

Proof. We start with a solution $\{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} : i+j \leq m+1\}$ from Lemma 10.10. For an index (i,j) with $i+j > m+1$, we take

$$y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} := (-1)^{i+j-m-1}\, y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m+1-j,m+1-i}. \tag{10.17}$$

We show that (10.17) forms a solution for (10.13). For $(i,j) \in B(m)$ with $i+j \geq m+2$, it is straightforward to see

$$\partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = -\partial_m(m+1-j, m+1-i)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$$

by Lemma 10.10. For an index (i,j) with $i+j = m+1$,

$$\partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j+1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i-1,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,j}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j-1}} = \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i-1,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i-1,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,j}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,j}} = 0.$$

From (10.15) for (i,j) with $i+j \leq m+1$, it follows (10.15) for (i,j) with $i+j > m+1$ because

$$y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} = (-1)^{i+j-m-1}\, y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m+1-j,m+1-i} = (-1)^{i+j-m-1}\, (y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m+1-i,m+1-j})^{-1} = (y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,i})^{-1}.$$

Thus, we have just found a symmetric solution $\{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} : (i,j) \in B(m)\}$ such that $y_{i,i} = \pm 1$. □

Corollary 10.12. *For any non-zero complex number* c*, there exists a solution* $\{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} : (i,j) \in B(m)\}$ *of the system* (10.13) *of equations such that*

(1) $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} \cdot y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,i} = c^2$.
(2) $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m} = c$
(3) $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i} = \pm c$ *for any* $1 \leq i < m$.

Proof. The component $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m}$ of a solution from Proposition 10.11 is either 1 or -1. By multiplying by $\pm c$, because of Lemma 10.9, we have another solution satisfying (1), (2) and (3). □

10.4. **Inside of** $B(m)$**.**

Assume that the split leading term equation of $\Gamma(n)$ associated to $B(m)$ has a solution for some non-zero complex numbers $c^{\mathrm{hor},\mathbb{C}}_{i,i+1}$'s and $c^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}_{j+1,j}$'s for $i,j \geq k$. Let

$$y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m},\ y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m+1}, \cdots, y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m+1} \tag{10.18}$$

where $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}$ is the (i,j)-th component of a solution of the split leading term equation, which is a non-zero complex number. By Corollary 10.12, we obtain a symmetric complex solution such that c becomes the (m,m)-component $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m}$ of the solution. In order to emphasize that (10.18) is pre-determined, let

$$d_{i,j} := y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}.$$

Setting it as the initial part for a solution and using Lemma 10.8, we extend it to a solution of (10.11) in Λ_U. For a pictorial outline of Section 10.4, see Figure 38.



FIGURE 38. Pictorial outline of Section 10.4.

Step 1. $(i,j) \in B(m)$ **with** $i+j \leq m+1$

We begin by taking $y_{i,j} := y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} \subset \Lambda_U$ where $\{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j} : (i,j) \in B(m)\}$ is a solution satisfying $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m} = d_{m,m}$ from Corollary 10.12 for all indices (i,j)'s with $i+j \leq m+1$. Then, the equations $\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for $i+j \leq m$ hold because $\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = \partial_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y})\, T^{1-t}$ by (9.6).

Step 2. $(i,j) \in B(m)$ **with** $i+j = m+2$

Next, we determine all entries $y_{i,j}$'s of the anti-diagonal given by $i+j = m+2$ within $B(m)$. For this purpose, we decompose the equation $\partial(1,m)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in the system (9.6) into two pieces as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial(1,m)(\mathbf{y}) &= \left(\frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{2,m}} + \frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{y_{1,m+1}}{y_{1,m}}\right) T^{1+(m-1)t} \\
&= \left(\frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{2,m}} + \frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{y_{1,m+1}}{y_{1,m}} + a_1 \frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}} - a_1 \frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}}\right) T^{1+(m-1)t} \\
&= \left(\frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{2,m}} + \frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}} - a_1 \frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}} T^{mt}\right) T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{y_{1,m+1}}{y_{1,m}} + a_1 \frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}}\right) T^{1+(m-1)t}
\end{aligned}$$

where a_1 will be determined shortly.

In order to solve $\partial(1,m)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, it suffices to find a solution of the following system

$$\begin{cases}
\partial(1,m)^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) := \dfrac{y_{1,m}}{y_{2,m}} + \dfrac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}} - a_1 \dfrac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}} T^{mt} = 0 \\
\partial(1,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) := -\dfrac{y_{1,m+1}}{y_{1,m}} + a_1 \dfrac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}} = 0
\end{cases} \tag{10.19}$$

By our choice of $y_{i,j}$'s so far, we have

$$\frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}} = \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m-1}} \neq 0.$$

Then, $y_{1,m+1} = d_{1,m+1}$ uniquely determines the value $a_1 \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ from $\partial(1,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$. Then, there exists a unique $y_{2,m} \in \Lambda_U$ such that $\partial(1,m)^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$.

By applying Lemma 10.8 succesively, we can determine the remaining entries of the anti-diagonal containing $y_{2,m}$ within $B(m)$. Namely, from a pre-determined $y_{i+1,m-i+1} \in \Lambda_U$ with $\mathfrak{v}_T(y_{i+1,m-i+1} - y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,m-i+1}) = mt$, we determine a solution $y_{i+2,m-i} \in \Lambda_U$ of $\partial(i+1,m-i)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ so that

$$\mathfrak{v}_T\left(y_{i+2,m-i} - y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+2,m-i}\right) = mt. \tag{10.20}$$

Then, all anti-diagonal entries $y_{i+2,m-i}$'s inside $B(m)$ are chosen to obey

$$\begin{cases}
\partial(1,m)^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \\
\partial(i+1,m-i)(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq m-2.
\end{cases}$$

Plugging the previously determined $y_{i,j}$'s into $\partial(m,1)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, we convert $\partial(m,1)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ into $\partial(m,1)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ of the form (10.22). By solving $\partial(m,1)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, we obtain $y_{m+1,1}$.

We would like to find a sufficient condition that $y_{m+1,1}$ exists in Λ_U such that $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m+1,1} \equiv y_{m+1,1} \mod T^{>0}$. Because of (10.20), we put

$$y_{i+2,m-i} \equiv y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+2,m-i} + A_i \cdot T^{mt} \mod T^{>mt} \tag{10.21}$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$. A straightforward calculation via consideration of $\partial(i+1,m-i)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ gives us the following lemma.

Lemma 10.13. *A recurrence relation for A_i's is*

$$\begin{cases}
A_0 &= -a_1 \cdot y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m-1} \\
A_i &= -\dfrac{\left(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+2,m-i}\right)^2}{\left(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,m-i}\right)^2} A_{i-1}.
\end{cases}$$

From (10.21) and Lemma 10.13, it follows

$$\begin{aligned}\partial(m,1)(\mathbf{y})T^{t-1} &= -\frac{y_{m-1,1}}{y_{m,1}} - \frac{y_{m,2}}{y_{m,1}} + \frac{y_{m,1}}{y_{m+1,1}}T^{mt}\\ &\equiv \left(-\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m-1,1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,2}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}\right) + \left(-\frac{A_{m-2}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}{y_{m+1,1}}\right)T^{mt} \qquad \mod T^{>mt}\\ &\equiv \left((-1)^m a_1 \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m-1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}\left(\prod_{i=1}^{m-2}\frac{(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+2,m-i})^2}{(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,m-i})^2}\right) + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}{y_{m+1,1}}\right)T^{mt} \qquad \mod T^{>mt}.\end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 10.12, we have

- $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}\cdot y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,i} = (d_{m,m})^2$, $(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,i})^2 = (d_{m,m})^2$
- $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m-1} + y^{\mathbb{C}}_{2,m} = 0$
- $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m-1}\cdot y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m-1,1} = (d_{m,m})^2$,

Using them, we simplify the above expression as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\partial(m,1)(\mathbf{y})T^{t-1} &\equiv \left((-1)^m a_1 \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m-1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}\frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{2,m})^2} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}{y_{m+1,1}}\right)T^{mt} \qquad \mod T^{>mt}\\ &\equiv \left((-1)^m a_1 \frac{1}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}\frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{1,m-1}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}{y_{m+1,1}}\right)T^{mt} \qquad \mod T^{>mt}\\ &\equiv \left((-1)^m a_1 \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m-1,1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,1}}{y_{m+1,1}}\right)T^{mt} \qquad \mod T^{>mt}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\partial(m,1)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ yields

$$\partial(m,1)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) := (-1)^m a_1 \frac{y_{m-1,1}}{y_{m,1}} + \frac{y_{m,1}}{y_{m+1,1}} + \mathfrak{P}(m,1)^{(2)}(a_1) = 0 \tag{10.22}$$

for some constant $\mathfrak{P}(m,1)^{(2)}(a_1) \in \Lambda_+$ (depending on a_1). Then, $y_{m+1,1} \in \Lambda_U$ can be determined so that $\partial(m,1)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ holds. Because of Corollary 10.12 and (10.19), we observe

$$y_{m+1,1} \equiv (-1)^{m+1}\frac{1}{a_1}\frac{(y_{m,1})^2}{y_{m-1,1}} \equiv (-1)^{m+1}\frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{a_1}\frac{y_{1,m-1}}{(y_{1,m})^2} \equiv (-1)^{m+1}\frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{y_{1,m+1}} \mod T^{>0}, \tag{10.23}$$

which explains why the equation $\partial_m(1)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in the system (10.6) appears. In other words, (10.8) provides a sufficient condition to solve $y_{m+1,1}$ over Λ_U in (10.22) such that $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m+1,1} \equiv y_{m+1,1} \mod T^{>0}$.

Step 3. $(i,j) \in B(m)$ **with** $m+2 < i+j \le 2m$

Now, we determine all elements $y_{i,j}$'s for $(i,j) \in B(m)$ satisfying $m+2 < i+j < 2m$. For an index j with $2 < j < m$, we decompose $\partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) &= \left(-\frac{y_{j-1,m}}{y_{j,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}}\right)T^{1-t} + \left(-\frac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}}\right)T^{1+(m-j)t}\\ &= \left(\left(-\frac{y_{j-1,m}}{y_{j,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}}\right) + \left(-a_j\frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} - a_j\frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}}\right)T^{(m-j+1)t}\right)T^{1-t}\\ &+ \left(-\frac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} + a_j\frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + a_j\frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}}\right)T^{1+(m-j)t}\end{aligned}$$

In order to have a solution of $\partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, we decompose it into the following equations.

$$\begin{cases}\partial(j,m)^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) := \left(-\dfrac{y_{j-1,m}}{y_{j,m}} + \dfrac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \dfrac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}}\right) - a_j\left(\dfrac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \dfrac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}}\right)T^{(m-j+1)t} = 0\\[2ex] \partial(j,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) := -\dfrac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} + a_j\left(\dfrac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \dfrac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}}\right) = 0.\end{cases}$$

Due to the following lemma, it is enough to find a solution of the following system to solve $\partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$.

Lemma 10.14. *A solution of the system*

$$\begin{cases} \partial(j,m)^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0 \\ \partial(j,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) - a_j \cdot \partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y})\, T^{t-1} = -\dfrac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} + a_j \left(\dfrac{y_{j-1,m}}{y_{j,m}} + \dfrac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}}\, T^{(m-j+1)t} \right) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{10.24}$$

is also a solution of $\partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$.

Proof. Note that

$$\partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) = \partial(j,m)^{(1)}(\mathbf{y})\, T^{1-t} + \partial(j,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y})\, T^{1+(m-j)t}.$$

A solution of (10.24) satisfies

$$\partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) = \partial(j,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y})\, T^{1+(m-j)t} = a_j \cdot \partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y})\, T^{(m-j+1)t},$$

which gives rise to $\partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$. □

Suppose that we are given a solution

$$\{y_{r,s} \in \Lambda_U : (r,s) \in B(m),\ r+s \le m+j\}$$

of $\partial(r,s)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for all $(r,s) \in B(m)$ and $r+s < m+j$ such that

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(y_{r,s} - y^{\mathbb{C}}_{r,s}) \ge (m-j+2)t$$

as the induction hypothesis. Since each $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{r,s}$ is non-zero by our choice, we then obtain $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j-1,m}/y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m} \neq 0$ so that $\partial(j,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) - a_j \cdot \partial(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) T^{t-1} = 0$ determines a unique value $a_j \in \Lambda_U$ from $y_{j,m+1} = d_{j,m+1}$. Then, the equation $\partial(j,m)^{(1)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ yields

$$\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} \left(1 - a_j\, T^{(m-j+1)t}\right) \equiv \left(\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j-1,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m-1}} \right) + a_j \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j-1,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}}\, T^{(m-j+1)t} \mod T^{>(m-j+1)t}.$$

Keeping in mind that $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{r,s}$'s from Corollary 10.12 satisfy

$$\partial_m(j,m)(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j-1,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j+1,m}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m-1}} = 0,$$

we obtain

$$\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j+1,m}} \neq 0 \text{ and } \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j-1,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m-1}} \neq 0$$

since $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m}$ is non-zero. Hence $y_{j+1,m} \in \Lambda_U$ with $\mathfrak{v}_T(y_{j+1,m} - y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j+1,m}) = (m-j+1)t$.

Suppose that

$$\{y_{r,s} \in \Lambda_U : (r,s) \in B(m),\ r+s \le m+j\} \cup \{y_{r,s} \in \Lambda_U : (r,s) \in B(m),\ r+s = m+j+1,\ r > m-i\}$$

are given and $\mathfrak{v}_T(y_{i+j,m-i+1} - y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+j,m-i+1}) = (m-j+1)t$. By Lemma 10.8, the equation $\partial(i+j, m-i) = 0$ determines $y_{i+j+1,m-i} \in \Lambda_U$ such that

$$\mathfrak{v}_T(y_{i+j+1,m-i} - y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+j+1,m-i}) = (m-j+1)t. \tag{10.25}$$

In order to find $y_{m+1,j}$, we convert $\partial(m,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ into $\partial(m,j)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ by inserting the previously determined $y_{i,j}$'s. For $0 \le i \le m-j-1$, due to (10.25), we may set

$$y_{i+j+1,m-i} \equiv y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+j+1,m-i} + A_i \cdot T^{(m-j+1)t} \mod T^{>(m-j+1)t}$$

where $A_i \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$. As in Lemma 10.13, we derive the following lemma.

Lemma 10.15. *A recurrence relation for* A_i*'s is*

$$\begin{cases} A_0 &= -a_j \cdot \frac{(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j+1,m})^2}{(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j,m})^2} \cdot y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j-1,m} \\ A_i &= -\frac{\left(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+j+1,m-i}\right)^2}{\left(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+j,m-i}\right)^2} A_{i-1}. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 10.15 and Corollary 10.12,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial(m,j)(\mathbf{y})T^{t-1} &= \left(-\frac{y_{m,j+1}}{y_{m,j}} - \frac{y_{m-1,j}}{y_{m,j}} + \frac{y_{m,j}}{y_{m,j-1}}\right) + \frac{y_{m,j}}{y_{m+1,j}}T^{(m-j+1)t} \\
&\equiv \left(-\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j+1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m-1,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j-1}}\right) + \left(-\frac{A_{m-j-1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}{y_{m+1,j}}\right)T^{(m-j+1)t} \qquad \mod T^{>(m-j+1)t} \\
&\equiv \left((-1)^{m-j+1}a_j\,\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{j-1,m}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}\left(\prod_{i=0}^{m-j-1}\frac{(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+j+1,m-i})^2}{(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i+j,m-i})^2}\right) + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}{y_{m+1,j}}\right)T^{(m-j+1)t} \qquad \mod T^{>(m-j+1)t} \\
&\equiv \left((-1)^{m-j+1}a_j\,\frac{1}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}\frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j-1}}\frac{(y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j})^2}{(d_{m,m})^2} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}{y_{m+1,j}}\right)T^{(m-j+1)t} \qquad \mod T^{>(m-j+1)t} \\
&\equiv \left((-1)^{m-j+1}a_j\,\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j-1}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}{y_{m+1,j}}\right)T^{(m-j+1)t} \qquad \mod T^{>(m-j+1)t}
\end{aligned}$$

which yields

$$\partial(m,j)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = \left((-1)^{m-j+1}a_j\,\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j-1}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,j}}{y_{m+1,j}}\right) + \mathfrak{P}(m,j)^{(2)}(a_1,\cdots,a_j) = 0. \tag{10.26}$$

for some $\mathfrak{P}(m,j)^{(2)}(a_1,\cdots,a_j) \in \Lambda_+$. We then have

$$y_{m+1,j} \equiv (-1)^{m-j}\,\frac{y_{m,j-1}}{a_j} \equiv (-1)^{m-j}\,\frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{a_j\cdot y_{j-1,m}} \equiv (-1)^{m-j}\frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{y_{j,m+1}} \mod T^{>0}. \tag{10.27}$$

which explains why the equation $\partial_m(j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ in the system (10.6) appears. In other words, (10.8) provides a sufficient condition to solve $y_{m+1,j}$ over Λ_U in (10.26) such that $y_{m+1,j} = y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m+1,j}$.

Finally, we convert $\partial(m,m)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ into $\partial(m,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ as follows. Inserting $y_{m-1,m}, y_{m,m}, y_{m,m-1}$ and $y_{m,m+1} = d_{m,m+1}$ into $\partial(m,m)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, we derive

$$\partial(m,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) = \left(-\frac{y_{m,m+1}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m}} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m}}{y_{m+1,m}}\right) + \mathfrak{P}(m,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{a}) = 0 \tag{10.28}$$

for some $\mathfrak{P}(m,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{a}) \in \Lambda_+$. We obtain

$$y_{m+1,m} \equiv \frac{(y_{m,m})^2}{y_{m,m+1}} \mod T^{>0}$$

and determine $y_{m+1,m}$ in Λ_U.

In summary, the above discussion is summarized as follows.

Proposition 10.16. *For any tuple $(d_{m,m}, d_{1,m+1}, \cdots, d_{m,m+1})$ of non-zero complex numbers, there exist*

- $y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U$ *for* $(i,j) \in B(m)$,
- $y_{i,m+1} \in \Lambda_U$ *for* $1 \le i \le m$,
- $y_{m+1,j} \in \Lambda_U$ *for* $1 \le j \le m$

satisfying

(1) $y_{m,m} \equiv d_{m,m} \mod T^{>0}$,
(2) $y_{i,m+1} = d_{i,m+1}$ *for each* $i = 1, \cdots, m$,
(3) $\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ *for* $(i,j) \in B(m)$,
(4) $(-1)^{m+1-l}\,\dfrac{y_{l,m+1}}{y_{m,m}} + \dfrac{y_{m,m}}{y_{m+1,l}} \equiv 0 \mod T^{>0}$.

10.5. **Outside of $B(m)$.**

Suppose that we are given a complex solution

$$\{y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\}\}$$

for (10.6) together with non-zero complex numbers $c_{i+1,i}^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}$'s and $c_{j,j+1}^{\mathrm{hor},\mathbb{C}}$'s, which is the hypothesis of Theorem 10.7. In this section, we discuss how to determine a bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}$ in (10.4) from $c_{i+1,i}^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}$'s and $c_{j,j+1}^{\mathrm{hor},\mathbb{C}}$'s and how to extend it to a solution in Λ_U from $y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}$'s for $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$. Assume that $m < k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$. For the case $m = k$, see Remark 10.18. Here is a pictorial outline of the section.



FIGURE 39. Pictorial outline of Section 10.5.

Step 1. $(i,j) \in B(m) \cup \mathcal{I}_{\mathbf{seed}}$

Let

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{seed}} := \left\{(m,m), (1,m+1), \cdots, (m,m+1), (m+1,m+1), (m+1,m+2), \cdots, \left(\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil\right)\right\} \tag{10.29}$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{initial}} := \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{seed}}\backslash\{(m,m)\}. \tag{10.30}$$

Remark 10.17. We will define a *seed* in Definition 11.1 to generate a candidate for a solution for the split leading term equation. The set (10.29) is the collection of indices where the corresponding variables will be generically chosen as the initial step.

We start to take $y_{i,j} := y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}}$ for $(i,j) \in \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{initial}}$. Then, we fix a complex solution in $B(m)$ from Corollary 10.12 such that $c = y_{m,m}^{\mathbb{C}}$.

Step 2. $(i,j) \in B(k)\backslash B(m)$

By following Section 10.4, the chosen element $y_{1,m+1} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ determines $y_{i+1,m-i+1}$'s in Λ_U for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$. Moreover, we have $y_{m+1,1} \in \Lambda_U$. Again by Section 10.4, we also find $y_{i,j}$'s in Λ_U for (i,j) with $i \leq m+1$, $j \leq m+1$ and $i+j = m+3$ satisfying (10.27). If $m+1 = k$, then proceed to the next anti-diagonal. If $m+1 < k$, then it remains to determine $y_{1,m+2}$ and $y_{m+2,1}$ in this anti-diagonal within $B(k)\backslash B(m)$. Since the hypothesis of Lemma 10.8 is fulfilled at the equations $\partial(1,m+1)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ and $\partial(m+1,1)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ by our standing assumption, they are determined in Λ_U. Proceeding inductively, we fill up all $y_{i,j}$'s for $(i,j) \in B(k)\backslash B(m)$ obeying

(1) $y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U$ such that $y_{i,j} \equiv y_{i,j}^{\mathbb{C}} \mod T^{>0}$,
(2) $\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ for $(i,j) \in B(k-1)$.

Step 3. $(i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(k)$ **and** $\mathfrak{b}$

We determine $y_{i,j}$'s for $(i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(k)$ and $\mathfrak{b}_{i,i+1}^{\mathrm{hor}}$'s and $\mathfrak{b}_{j+1,j}^{\mathrm{ver}}$'s in (10.4) over Λ_U. Notice that

$$\partial(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = \partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) \text{ for } (i,j) \in B(k-1)$$

because of our choice of $\mathfrak{b}$, and thus we may keep $\{y_{i,j} \in \Lambda_U : (i,j) \in B(k)\}$ as a solution of $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$.

From now on, we focus only on the case where $n = 2k-1$ because the case $n = 2k$ can be similarly dealt with. In this case, there are (k^2-1) variables in $B(k)$. As all variables $y_{k-1,k}, y_{k-2,k}$ and $y_{k-1,k-1}$ in

$$\partial(k-1,k)(\mathbf{y}) = -\frac{1}{y_{k-1,k}} - \frac{y_{k-2,k}}{y_{k-1,k}} + y_{k-1,k} + \frac{y_{k-1,k}}{y_{k-1,k-1}}$$

have been already determined by previous inductive steps, we do *not* have any extra variables to make $\partial(k-1,k)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ hold. It is time to adjust the equation $\partial(k-1,k)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$ by selecting $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{k+1,k}$ suitably. By (9.10), we have

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(k-1,k)(\mathbf{y}) := -\exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{k+1,k}) \cdot \frac{1}{y_{k-1,k}} - \frac{y_{k-2,k}}{y_{k-1,k}} + y_{k-1,k} + \frac{y_{k-1,k}}{y_{k-1,k-1}}.$$

From the following equation

$$-c^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}_{k+1,k} \cdot \frac{1}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k}} - \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-2,k}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k}} + y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k-1}} = 0,$$

one equation in the split leading term equation, it follows that

$$-\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-2,k}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k}} + y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k-1}} \neq 0,$$

otherwise $-c^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}_{k+1,k} = 0$. Since

$$-\frac{y_{k-2,k}}{y_{k-1,k}} + y_{k-1,k} + \frac{y_{k-1,k}}{y_{k-1,k-1}} \equiv -\frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-2,k}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k}} + y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k} + \frac{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k}}{y^{\mathbb{C}}_{k-1,k-1}} \neq 0 \mod T^{>0},$$

there exists a unique bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{k+1,k} \in \Lambda_0$ such that

(1) $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(k-1,k)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$
(2) $\exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{k+1,k}) \equiv c^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}_{k+1,k} \mod T^{>0}$

Notice that $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{k+1,k}$ does not only deforms $\frac{1}{y_{k-1,k}}$, but also deforms $\frac{y_{j,k+1}}{y_{j,k}}$ into $\exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{k+1,k}) \cdot \frac{y_{j,k+1}}{y_{j,k}}$ for all j with $1 \leq j < k-1$ as in Corollary 9.12. Therefore, we need to solve the deformed equation

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(j,k)(\mathbf{y}) := -\exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{k+1,k}) \cdot \frac{y_{j,k+1}}{y_{j,k}} - \frac{y_{j-1,k}}{y_{j,k}} + \frac{y_{j,k}}{y_{j+1,k}} + \frac{y_{j,k}}{y_{j,k-1}} = 0$$

in order to decide $y_{\bullet,k+1} \in \Lambda_U$.

For the induction hypothesis, assume that $y_{r,s}$'s for $s \leq j$ and $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{s,s-1}$'s for $s \leq j$ are determined. We pick a bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j} \in \Lambda_0$ so that

(1) $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(n-j,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$
(2) $\exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}) \equiv c^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}_{j+1,j} \mod T^{>0}$.

After fixing $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$, we determine $y_{\bullet,j+1} \in \Lambda_U$. Hence, all entries above $B(k)$ together with $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$'s are determined in this way. Symmetrically, we can choose $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}$'s and fill up the other part of $\Gamma(n)\backslash B(k)$. Hence, Theorem 10.7 is now verified.

Remark 10.18. We outline the proof of Theorem 10.7 when $n = 2k$ and $m = k$. In this case, taking $c = 1$ for $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m}$, Corollary 10.12 will give us the initial parts $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{i,j}$'s of $y_{i,j}$'s for $(i,j) \in B(m)$. We then follow Section 10.4 to extend to $y_{i,j}$'s in Λ_U. If one uses both $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{m+1,m}$ and $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{m,m+1}$ to deform $\partial(m,m) = 0$, then we have two extra variables $c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{m+1,m}$ and $c^{\mathrm{hor}}_{m,m+1}$ in $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(m,m) = 0$. For our convenience, recall that we have chosen $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{m,m+1} = 0$ in Remark 10.4. Now, we need to take $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{m+1,m}$ so that $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(m,m) = 0$. Since $y^{\mathbb{C}}_{m,m} = 1$, we get $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{m+1,m} \in \Lambda_+$, which yields that $1 = c^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}_{m+1,m} = \exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{m+1,m}) \mod T^{>0}$. After fixing $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{m+1,m}$, we solve $y_{\bullet,m+1}$ by solving $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(\bullet,m)^{(2)} = 0$ where

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(1,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) := -\exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{m+1,m}) \frac{y_{1,m+1}}{y_{1,m}} + a_1 \frac{y_{1,m}}{y_{1,m-1}} = 0$$

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}(j,m)^{(2)}(\mathbf{y}) := -\exp(\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{m+1,m}) \frac{y_{j,m+1}}{y_{j,m}} + a_j \left(\frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j+1,m}} + \frac{y_{j,m}}{y_{j,m-1}} \right) = 0 \quad \text{for } j > 2.$$

The remaining steps are similar to the case for $m < k$ in Section 10.5.

11. Solvability of split leading term equation

This section aims to verify the assumption for Theorem 10.7 when the split leading term equation (10.6) comes from the line segment $I_m \subset \triangle_\lambda$ in (8.5). To find its solution, we introduce a *seed* generating a candidate for a solution and prove that there exists a "good" choice of seeds such that the candidate is indeed a solution.

11.1. **Seeds.**

We begin by the definition of a seed. Recall the notations $\Gamma(n)$ and $B(m)$ in (10.1).

Definition 11.1. A *seed* of $\Gamma(n)$ *associated to* $B(m)$ consists of the two data $(\mathbf{d}, \mathcal{I})$.

- An $(n-m)$-tuple $\mathbf{d}$ of elements in Λ_U
$$\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \cdots, d_{n-m})$$
- An $(n-m)$-tuple I of double indices
$$\mathcal{I} = \{(m,m), (i_1, j_1), \cdots, (i_{n-m-1}, j_{n-m-1})\} \subset \{(m,m)\} \cup (\Gamma(n) \backslash B(m))$$
satisfying
  (1) the first index is (m,m)
  (2) the remaining indices are contained in $\Gamma(n)\backslash B(m)$ such that any two indices must not come from the same anti-diagonal of $\Gamma(n)\backslash B(m)$.

We are particularly interested in seeds $(\mathbf{d}, \mathcal{I})$ of the form

- $\mathbf{d}$ is a tuple of *non-zero real* numbers.
- $\mathcal{I} := \mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}}$ in (10.29).

Let $\mathbf{y}_\mathcal{I}$ denote the components of $\mathbf{y}$ associated to the set $\mathcal{I}$ of indices. Namely,

$$\mathbf{y}_\mathcal{I} := \left(y_{m,m}, y_{i_1,j_1}, \cdots, y_{i_{n-m-1}, j_{n-m-1}}\right).$$

Then, as the initial step, we take

$$\mathbf{y}_\mathcal{I} := \mathbf{d}.$$

So, the double indices designate the places in which the components of $\mathbf{d}$ are plugged. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is always taken to be $\mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}}$, $\mathcal{I}$ will be often omitted from now on. We instead set $d_{i,j}$ to denote the component of $\mathbf{d}$ corresponding to (i,j). For instance, we have $d_1 = d_{m,m}$.

Following the procedure in Section 10.5, see Figure 39, we generate the other $y_{i,j}$'s such that $\mathbf{y}$ satisfies the split leading term equation with a suitable choice of complex numbers

$$\mathbf{c} := \left(c^{\text{hor}}_{k,k+1}, \cdots, c^{\text{hor}}_{n-1,n}, c^{\text{ver}}_{k+1,k}, \cdots, c^{\text{ver}}_{n,n-1}\right).$$

Namely, by isolating one undetermined variable and plugging the determined variables in one equation of the split leading term equation, we can solve the remaining $y_{i,j}$'s and $\mathbf{c}$ inductively. However, the undetermined variable might be zero or undefined when generating a candidate from a seed. A *good* choice of seed, we call a *generic* seed, must avoid the issue.

We would like to find a condition for generic seeds. In the setup of (10.5) and Remark 10.4, we put

$$\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) := \begin{cases} -c^{\text{ver}}_{j,j-1} \cdot \dfrac{1}{y_{i,j-1}} + \dfrac{1}{(y_{i,j})^2}\left(c^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} \cdot y_{i,j+1} + c^{\text{hor}}_{i-1,i} \cdot y_{i-1,j}\right) & \text{if } i \geq j \\ -c^{\text{hor}}_{i-1,i} \cdot y_{i-1,j} + (y_{i,j})^2 \left(c^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} \cdot \dfrac{1}{y_{i+1,j}} + c^{\text{ver}}_{j,j-1} \cdot \dfrac{1}{y_{i,j-1}}\right) & \text{if } i < j. \end{cases} \tag{11.1}$$

Note that $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{y})$ is achieved by isolating $c^{\text{hor}}_{i,i+1} \cdot (y_{i+1,j})^{-1}$ and $c^{\text{ver}}_{j+1,j} \cdot y_{i,j+1}$ in $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$, see (10.7). Moreover, (11.1) appears when isolating the undetermined variable so that the expression is required to be non-zero.

Definition 11.2. A seed $\mathbf{d}$ is called *generic* if the candidate generated by $\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{d}$ satisfies

$$\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0 \mod T^{>0} \tag{11.2}$$

for all (i,j)'s.

Example 11.3. A straightforward calculation asserts that the tuples

(1) $\mathbf{d} = (-1,1,1,-1,1)$
(2) $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}} = ((2,2),(1,3),(2,3),(3,3),(3,4))$

form a generic seed of $\Gamma(7)$ to $B(2)$. The tuples

(1) $\mathbf{d} = (-1,1,1,1,1)$
(2) $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\text{seed}} = ((2,2),(1,3),(2,3),(3,3),(3,4))$

form a seed of $\Gamma(7)$ to $B(2)$, but not a generic seed because $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_2}(1,5)(\mathbf{y}) = 0$.

The main proposition of this section is the existence of a generic seed, which will be proven throughout this section.

Proposition 11.4. *For each integer m where $2 \leq m \leq k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$, a generic seed of $\Gamma(n)$ to $B(m)$ exists.*

As a corollary, we assert solvability of the split leading term equation.

Corollary 11.5. *The split leading term equation of $\Gamma(n)$ associated to $B(m)$ has a solution each component of which is a non-zero complex number.*

Proof. Once a seed has the property (11.2), the remaining $y_{i,j}$'s and a sequence $\mathbf{c}$ are (uniquely) determined to be in $\mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\}$ by the exactly same process in Section 10.5. □

11.2. **Pre-generic elements.**

We now introduce a coordinate system $\{z_{i,j} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\}\}$ with respect to which the system of equations

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) = 0, \quad \text{for } i+j < n$$

does *not* depend on the choice of a bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}$. We define

$$\begin{cases} z_{i+1,\bullet} := \left(\prod_{r=k}^{i} c^{\text{hor}}_{r,r+1}\right)^{-1} y_{i+1,\bullet} & \text{if } i \geq k \\ z_{\bullet,j+1} := \left(\prod_{r=k}^{j} c^{\text{ver}}_{r+1,r}\right) y_{\bullet,j+1} & \text{if } j \geq k \\ z_{i,j} := y_{i,j} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{11.3}$$

Under this coordinate system, we convert $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(i,j)(\mathbf{y})$ in (10.7) into

$$\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) := \begin{cases} -\frac{z_{i,j+1}}{z_{i,j}} - \frac{z_{i-1,j}}{z_{i,j}} + \frac{z_{i,j}}{z_{i+1,j}} + \frac{z_{i,j}}{z_{i,j-1}} & \text{if } i+j < n \\ -\left(\prod_{r=k}^{i-1} c^{\text{hor}}_{r,r+1}\right)^{-1} \frac{1}{z_{i,j}} - \frac{z_{i-1,j}}{z_{i,j}} + \left(\prod_{r=k}^{i} c^{\text{hor}}_{r,r+1}\right) z_{i,j} + \frac{z_{i,j}}{z_{i,j-1}} & \text{if } i \geq j,\ i+j = n \\ -\left(\prod_{r=k}^{j} c^{\text{ver}}_{r+1,r}\right) \frac{1}{z_{i,j}} - \frac{z_{i-1,j}}{z_{i,j}} + \left(\prod_{r=k}^{j-1} c^{\text{ver}}_{r+1,r}\right)^{-1} z_{i,j} + \frac{z_{i,j}}{z_{i,j-1}} & \text{if } i < j,\ i+j = n. \end{cases} \tag{11.4}$$

Here, one should interpret that the product over the empty set is 1. For example,

$$\prod_{r=k}^{k-1} c^{\text{ver}}_{r+1,r} = 1.$$

We set

(11.5)
$$\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) := \begin{cases} -\dfrac{1}{z_{i,j-1}} + \dfrac{1}{(z_{i,j})^2}\left(z_{i,j+1} + z_{i-1,j}\right)\left(= \dfrac{1}{z_{i+1,j}}\right) & \text{if } i \geq j,\ i+j < n \\ -z_{i-1,j} + (z_{i,j})^2\left(\dfrac{1}{z_{i+1,j}} + \dfrac{1}{z_{i,j-1}}\right)(= z_{i,j+1}) & \text{if } i < j,\ i+j < n \\ -\dfrac{1}{z_{i,j-1}} + \dfrac{1}{(z_{i,j})^2}\left(\left(\displaystyle\prod_{r=k}^{i-1} c^{\text{hor}}_{r,r+1}\right)^{-1} + z_{i-1,j}\right)\left(= \left(\displaystyle\prod_{r=k}^{i} c^{\text{hor}}_{r,r+1}\right)\right) & \text{if } i \geq j,\ i+j = n \\ -z_{i-1,j} + (z_{i,j})^2\left(\left(\displaystyle\prod_{r=k}^{j-1} c^{\text{ver}}_{r+1,r}\right)^{-1} + \dfrac{1}{z_{i,j-1}}\right)\left(= \left(\displaystyle\prod_{r=k}^{j} c^{\text{ver}}_{r+1,r}\right)\right) & \text{if } i < j,\ i+j = n, \end{cases}$$

where $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z})$ is obtained from isolating the expression in the parentheses in $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(i,j)(\mathbf{z})$.

We then have the following lemma, which says it suffices to check $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ to show $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$.

Lemma 11.6. *$\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ for all indices $(i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(m)$ if and only if $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{y}) \neq 0$ for all indices $(i,j) \in \Gamma(n)\backslash B(m)$.*

Proof. Under the coordinate change (11.3), (11.1) is converted into (11.5). □

To show that $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$, we now start to solve (11.4) from $\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} := \mathbf{d}$ by isolating the undetermined variable in (11.4). When $m < k = \lceil n/2 \rceil$, since $\mathcal{I} \subset B(k)$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{I}}$ because of (11.3), we may insert $\mathbf{d}$ into $\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{I}}$ as the starting point. For the case $m = k$, we take $c^{\text{hor}}_{m,m+1} = 1$ and $c^{\text{ver}}_{m+1,m} = 1$ (see Remark 10.18) and hence $\mathbf{z}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{I}} = \mathbf{d}$ as well. For simplicity, we set

$$\mathbf{z}_{(l\backslash m)} := \{z_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{0\} : (i,j) \in \Gamma(l)\backslash B(m) \cup \{(m,m)\}\}. \tag{11.6}$$

Choosing the component in an anti-diagonal generically, we can easily make the first two equations of (11.5) non-zero because of the following lemma.

Lemma 11.7. *Suppose that the set $\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1\backslash m)}$ is determined. Each variable $z_{r-i,s+i}$ can be expressed as a* non-constant *rational function with respect to $z_{r,s}$.*

Proof. We only show the case for $i > 0$ since the case where $i < 0$ can be similarly proven. Let

$$X(i) := z_{r-i,s+i}.$$

By (11.4), a recurrence relation for $X(i)$'s is

$$X(i) = [i] + \frac{[i,i-1]}{X(i-1)} \tag{11.7}$$

where

$$[i] := -z_{r-i-1,s+i} + \frac{(z_{r-i,s+i-1})^2}{z_{r-i,s+i-2}},\ [i,i-1] := (z_{r-i,s+i-1})^2.$$

Composing (11.7) several times, $X(i)$ is expressed as a continued fraction in terms of $X(0)$. Letting $A(0) = 1$ and $B(0) = 0$, it becomes

$$X(i) = \frac{A(i)\cdot X(0) + B(i)}{A(i-1)\cdot X(0) + B(i-1)} \tag{11.8}$$

for some constants $A(i)$'s and $B(i)$'s determined by the given set $\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1\backslash m)}$. Thus, $X(i)$ is a rational function with respect to $X(0)$.

To show that every $X(i)$ is *non-constant* with respect to $X(0)$, we investigate properties of $A(i)$'s and $B(i)$'s. By induction, we can show that the terms of $A(i)$ correspond to the partitions of $\{i, i-1, \cdots, 1\}$ into one single number or two consecutive numbers. Also, the terms of $B(i)$ correspond to the partitions of $\{i, i-1, \cdots, 1, 0\}$

into one single or two consecutive numbers containing the subset $[1,0]$. For instance, $A(3)$ and $B(3)$ are expressed as

$$A(3) = [3][2][1] + [3][2,1] + [3,2][1],$$
$$B(3) = [3][2][1,0] + [3,2][1,0].$$

It then follows that

$$A(i) = [i] \cdot A(i-1) + [i, i-1] \cdot A(i-2)$$
$$B(i) = [i] \cdot B(i-1) + [i, i-1] \cdot B(i-2).$$

Note that $X(0)$ and $X(1)$ are non-constant functions with respect to $X(0)$. Suppose to the contrary that $X(i)$ is a constant function with the value C and all $X(j)$'s for all $j < i$ are non-constant rational functions with respect to $X(0)$. Let

$$X(i) := \frac{A(i) \cdot X(0) + B(i)}{A(i-1) \cdot X(0) + B(i-1)} = C.$$

We then obtain

$$C \cdot A(i-1) = A(i) = [i] \cdot A(i-1) + [i, i-1] \cdot A(i-2)$$
$$C \cdot B(i-1) = B(i) = [i] \cdot B(i-1) + [i, i-1] \cdot B(i-2).$$

We claim that $C - [i] \neq 0$. Otherwise, $A(i-2) = B(i-2) = 0$ because $[i, i-1] = (z_{r-i,s+i-1})^2 \neq 0$. It yields that $X(i-2) \equiv 0$, contradicting to the assumption that $X(i-2)$ is not constant.

We then have

$$A(i-1) = C' \cdot A(i-2)$$
$$B(i-1) = C' \cdot B(i-2)$$

where $C' = [i, i-1]/(C - [i])$. So, we deduce a contradiction that

$$X(i-1) = \frac{A(i-1) \cdot X(0) + B(i-1)}{A(i-2) \cdot X(0) + B(i-2)} = C'$$

is constant. Hence, every $X(i)$ has to be a non-constant rational function. □

Corollary 11.8. *Suppose that the set $\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1\setminus m)}$ is determined. There exists a non-zero real number $d_{r,s}$ such that if we set $z_{r,s} = d_{r,s}$*

$$\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \tag{11.9}$$

for all (i,j)'s obeying $i + j = r + s - 1$.

Proof. Since each $z_{r-i,s+i}$ is a non-constant rational function with respect to $z_{r,s}$, there are only finitely many $z_{r,s}$'s so that $z_{r-i,s+i}$ is zero or is not defined. Avoid these values when choosing $d_{r,s}$. □

Definition 11.9. Suppose the set $\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1\setminus m)}$ is given. For an index $(r,s) \in \Gamma(n)\setminus B(m)$, an element $d_{r,s}$ is said to be *pre-generic with respect to* $\mathbf{z}_{(r+s-1\setminus m)}$ if (11.9) holds for any $(i,j) \in \Gamma(r+s)\setminus(B(m) \cup \Gamma(r+s-1))$.

For the later purpose, we prove the following property of the the pre-generic elements.

Lemma 11.10. *Assume that $m < k$. Suppose that we have $d_{s,m+1}$'s for s with $1 \leq s \leq m$ such that for each s, $d_{s,m+1}$ is pre-generic with respect to the previously determined $\mathbf{z}_{(s+m\setminus m)}$ by one choice of $d_{m,m}$ and $d_{1,m+1}, \cdots, d_{s-1,m+1}$. Then, regardless of a choice of $d_{m,m} \in \mathbb{C}\setminus\{0\}$, $d_{s,m+1}$ is pre-generic as long as we do not change $d_{1,m+1}, \cdots, d_{s-1,m+1}$.*

Proof. If $m < k$, we see $y_{i,j} = z_{i,j}$ for $(i,j) \in B(m)$ by (11.3). We claim that

$$z_{j,i+1} = (-1)^{i+j} \cdot \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i+1,j}}.$$

Recall from (10.8) that

$$z_{m+1,i} = (-1)^{i+(m+1)-1} \cdot \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i,m+1}},$$

which provides the initial step for the induction. Next, by the induction hypothesis, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= -\frac{z_{i,j+1}}{z_{i,j}} - \frac{z_{i-1,j}}{z_{i,j}} + \frac{z_{i,j}}{z_{i+1,j}} + \frac{z_{i,j}}{z_{i,j-1}} \\ &= \frac{z_{j,i}}{z_{j+1,i}} + \frac{z_{j,i}}{z_{j,i-1}} + (-1)^{i+j-1} \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i+1,j} \cdot z_{j,i}} - \frac{z_{j-1,i}}{z_{j,i}} \\ &= \frac{z_{j,i+1}}{z_{j,i}} + (-1)^{i+j-1} \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i+1,j}\, z_{j,i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain

$$z_{j,i+1} = (-1)^{i+j} \cdot \frac{(d_{m,m})^2}{z_{i+1,j}}.$$

Therefore, $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ as long as $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(j,i)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$. □

11.3. **Generic seeds.**

Applying Corollary 11.8, we make the first two expressions in (11.5) non-zero by taking one entry of an anti-diagonal generically. To make the last two equations non-zero, we need to select the previous ones more carefully. We deal with the three cases separately.

Case 1. $n = 2k-1$**.**

We need several lemmas.

Lemma 11.11. *Assume that $\mathbf{z}_{(n-2\setminus m)}$ is given. Suppose that either $d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$ is pre-generic or $k-1 = m$. Then, there is a real number $d_{k-1,k-1}$ (sufficiently close to -1) and a non-zero real number $d_{k-1,k}$ such that if $z_{k-1,k-1} = d_{k-1,k-1}$ and $z_{k-1,k} = d_{k-1,k}$,*

$$\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \mod T^{>0} \tag{11.10}$$

for all (i,j) with $i+j = n-1$ and $i+j = n$.

Note that $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z})$'s for (i,j) with $i+j=n$ provide the last two expressions of (11.5).

Proof. Assuming that $d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$ is pre-generic, by definition, every $z_{i,n-1-i}$ is defined and becomes non-zero if we set $z_{k-1,k-1} = d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$. By Corollary 11.8, we can choose and fix a pre-generic element $d_{k-1,k}$ for $z_{k-1,k}$ so that the entries $z_{i,n-i}$'s are also determined.

We would like to emphasize that $d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$ is never being a component of a generic seed because of the following reason. Recall that the equations $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) = 0$'s in (11.4) for (i,j)'s with $i+j \geq n$ and $i < j$ read

$$\begin{cases} \prod_{r=k}^{k} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r} &= -z_{k-2,k} + (z_{k-1,k})^2 \left(1 + \frac{1}{z_{k-1,k-1}}\right), \\ \prod_{r=k}^{k+1} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r} &= -z_{k-3,k+1} + (z_{k-2,k+1})^2 \left(\left(\prod_{r=k}^{k} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r}\right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{z_{k-2,k}} \right), \\ & \cdots \\ \prod_{r=k}^{n-2} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r} &= -z_{1,n-2} + (z_{2,n-2})^2 \left(\left(\prod_{r=k}^{n-3} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r}\right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{z_{2,n-3}} \right), \\ \prod_{r=k}^{n-1} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r} &= -(z_{1,n-1})^2 \left(\left(\prod_{r=k}^{n-2} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r}\right)^{-1} + \frac{1}{z_{1,n-2}} \right). \end{cases} \tag{11.11}$$

If one chooses $z_{k-1,k-1} = d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$, then from (11.11) we obtain

$$\prod_{r=k}^{j} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r} = -z_{n-j-1,j}$$

for $j = k, k+1, \cdots, n-2$ and

$$\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(1, n-1)(\mathbf{z}) = \prod_{r=k}^{n-1} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r} = 0. \tag{11.12}$$

Thus, a seed $\mathbf{d}$ is *not* generic [20]. Nevertheless, we claim that there exists a choice of $d_{k-1,k-1}$ not equal to -1 but close to -1 so that (11.10) is satisfied.

Note that the fixed $d_{k,k-1}$ remains to be pre-generic even if we perturb the value $z_{k-1,k-1}$ from -1 with sufficiently small amount. This is because the expression $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(i,j)(\mathbf{z})$ for each index (i,j) with $i+j = n-1$ is a continuous function with respect to $z_{k-1,k-1}$ at -1 after inserting $d_{k,k-1}$ into $z_{k,k-1}$. Also, by Lemma 11.7, there exists a dense set of pre-generic elements for $d_{k-1,k-1}$. Therefore, (11.10) is satisfied for $i+j = n-1$.

Also, we observe that as $z_{k-1,k-1} \to -1$, because of (11.5) and (11.11), $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(n-j, j)(\mathbf{z}) \to -z_{n-j-1,j}$ when $j \geq k$. Because $-z_{n-j-1,j} \neq 0$ for j with $k \leq j < n-1$, we still have $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(n-j, j)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ for j with $k \leq j < n-1$ if $d_{k-1,k-1}$ is sufficiently close to -1. Finally, we claim that $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(1, n-1)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$ as soon as $z_{k-1,k-1} \neq -1$ so that the problem in (11.12) is solved. From $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(k-1, k)(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ and $z_{k-1,k-1} \neq -1$, it follows that

$$c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{k+1,k} \neq -z_{k-2,k}.$$

Combining it with $\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m(k-2, k+1)(\mathbf{z}) = 0$, we obtain

$$\prod_{r=k}^{k+1} c^{\mathrm{ver}}_{r+1,r} \neq -z_{k-3,k+1}.$$

Proceeding inductively, we deduce $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(1, n-1)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0$. The discussion on the part where $j < k$ is omitted because the argument is symmetrical.

Consequently, we may choose a generic $d_{k-1,k-1}$ sufficiently close to -1 so that (11.10) holds for all (i,j) with $i+j = n-1$ and $i+j = n$.

It remains to take care of the case where $k-1 = m$. The index $(k-1, k-1) = (m, m)$ is contained in the box $B(m)$ so that $d_{k-1,k-1}$ can be freely chosen by Corollary 10.12. Thus, we can apply the exactly same argument as above. □

By applying a similar argument, we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 11.12. *Suppose that either $d_{i,i} = \pm 1$ is pre-generic for $i > m$ or $i = m$. There is a real number $d_{i,i}$ (sufficiently close to ± 1) and a non-zero real number $d_{i,i+1}$ so that $d_{i+1,i+1} = \mp 1$ becomes pre-generic.*

We now ready to start the proof of Proposition 11.4 for the case where $n = 2k-1$ and $m < k := \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

Proof of Proposition 11.4. We start with a tentative choice of $d_{m,m} = \pm 1$. Choosing pre-generic elements from $d_{1,m+1} := z_{1,m+1}$ to $d_{m-1,m+1} := z_{m-1,m+1}$, we find $\mathbf{z}_{(2m\setminus m)}$ so that that (11.10) is satisfied for each index (i,j) with $i+j \leq 2m-1$. Due to Lemma 11.12, we may select $d_{m,m}$ sufficiently close to ± 1 and $d_{m,m+1}$ so that $d_{m+1,m+1} = \mp 1$ becomes pre-generic. Because of Lemma 11.10, note that $d_{1,m+1}, \cdots, d_{m,m+1}$ remain to be pre-generic even if we choose another $d_{m,m}$. Moreover, applying Lemma 11.12 repeatedly, we assert that $d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$ is also pre-generic by suitably choosing $d_{\bullet,\bullet}$. Hence, we have (11.10) for all indices (i,j)'s with $i+j \leq n-2$. Finally, Lemma 11.11 says that there is $d_{k-1,k-1}$ and $d_{k,k-1}$ such that (11.10) holds for $i+j = n-1, n$. Thus, we have just found a generic seed. □

Case 2. $n = 2k$ **and** $m < k$**.**

Modifying the proofs of Lemma 11.11 and Lemma 11.12, we can prove the following lemma.

[20] We also have $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(n-1, 1)(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ if taking $z_{k-1,k-1} = d_{k-1,k-1} = -1$.

Lemma 11.13. *Assume that $\mathbf{z}_{(n-2\setminus m)}$ is given. Suppose that $d_{k-1,k} = -1$ is pre-generic. Then, there is a real number $d_{k-1,k}$ (sufficiently close to -1) and a non-zero real number $d_{k,k}$ such that if $z_{k-1,k} = d_{k-1,k}$ and $z_{k,k} = d_{k,k}$,*

$$\widetilde{\partial_m^{\mathfrak{b}}}(i,j)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \mod T^{>0}$$

for all (i,j) with $i+j = n-1$ and $i+j = n$.

Suppose that $d_{i-1,i} = \pm 1$ is pre-generic for $i \geq m+1$. There is a real number $d_{i-1,i}$ (sufficiently close to ± 1) and a non-zero real number $d_{i,i}$ so that $d_{i,i+1} = \mp 1$ becomes pre-generic.

Also, we need the lemma, which serves as the starting point to obtain the desired $d_{\bullet,\bullet}$'s.

Lemma 11.14. *$d_{m,m+1} = \pm 1$ can be pre-generic.*

Proof. By Lemma 10.10,

$$\widetilde{z}_{i,m+j} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r) & \text{for } i < j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{i-j-1} (2j+2r)^{-1} & \text{for } i > j \end{cases} \tag{11.13}$$

is a solution of $\partial_m^{\mathfrak{b}}(i, m+j)(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ in (11.4) for $m+i+j < n$. Furthermore, by Lemma 10.9, so does

$$z_{i,m+j} := a \cdot \widetilde{z}_{i,m+j} \tag{11.14}$$

for any non-zero complex number a. Selecting

$$a := \prod_{r=0}^{m-2} (2+2r),$$

$d_{m,m+1} = z_{m,m+1}$ becomes 1. Because of Lemma 11.10, no matter what we choose any non-zero complex number $d_{m,m}$, $d_{m,m+1}$ is pre-generic (with respect to the previous determined $\mathbf{z}_{(2m\setminus m)}$). □

Proof of Proposition 11.4 (continued). Combining Lemma 11.13 and Lemma 11.14, we conclude Proposition 11.4 for the case where $n = 2k$ and $m < k$. □

Case 3. $n = 2k$ **and** $m = k$**.**

In this case, we take $d_{m,m} = 1$, see Remark 10.18. Because of Lemma 10.10, note that

$$\widetilde{z}_{i,m+j} := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } i = j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r) & \text{for } i < j \\ \prod_{r=0}^{i-j-1} (2j+2r)^{-1} & \text{for } i > j \end{cases}, \quad \widetilde{z}_{m+i,j} := \begin{cases} (-1)^{m+i+j-1} & \text{for } i = j \\ (-1)^{m+i+j-1} \prod_{r=0}^{i-j-1} (2j+2r)^{-1} & \text{for } i > j \\ (-1)^{m+i+j-1} \prod_{r=0}^{j-i-1} (2i+2r) & \text{for } i < j \end{cases} \tag{11.15}$$

respectively form a solution of $\partial_m^{\mathfrak{b}}(i, m+j)(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ and $\partial_m^{\mathfrak{b}}(m+i, j)(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ in (11.4) for $m+i+j < n$. Also, our choice makes $\partial_m(l)(\mathbf{y}) = \partial_m(l)(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ in (10.8) because $c^{\text{ver}}_{m+1,m} = 1$ and $c^{\text{hor}}_{m,m+1} = 1$, see Remark 10.4 and Remark 10.18.

Furthermore,

$$z_{i,m+j} := a \cdot \widetilde{z}_{i,m+j}, \quad z_{m+i,j} := a^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{z}_{m+i,j} \tag{11.16}$$

are also solutions of (11.4) and (10.8) for any non-zero complex number a. Thus, we have a one-parameter family of solutions. Then, the expressions $\partial_m^{\mathfrak{b}}(i, m+j)(\mathbf{z})$ and $\partial_m^{\mathfrak{b}}(m+i, j)(\mathbf{z})$ for (i,j) with $i+j = n$ can be considered as a function with respect to a.

Lemma 11.15. *There exists a choice of the variable a such that*

$$\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(m-i,m+i)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \text{ and } \widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(m+i,m-i)(\mathbf{z}) \neq 0 \mod T^{>0} \tag{11.17}$$

in (11.5).

Proof. We claim that $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(m-i,m+i)(\mathbf{z})/z_{m-i,m+i}$ is a non-constant rational function with respect to a. For $i \geq 1$, we observe that

$$\frac{\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(m-1,m+1)(\mathbf{z})}{z_{m-1,m+1}} = -\frac{z_{m-2,m+1}}{z_{m-1,m+1}} + z_{m-1,m+1} = -(2m-4) + a \cdot \left(\prod_{r=0}^{m-3} (2+2r)^{-1} \right)$$

is a non-constant linear function with respect to a. By the induction hypothesis, assume that

$$\frac{\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(m-i,m+i)(\mathbf{z})}{z_{m-i,m+i}} := \frac{P_i(a)}{Q_i(a)}$$

is a non-constant rational function with respect to a. Then, we see

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(m-i-1,m+i+1)(\mathbf{z})}{z_{m-i-1,m+i+1}} &= \left(-\frac{z_{m-i-2,m+i+1}}{z_{m-i-1,m+i+1}} + \frac{z_{m-i-1,m+i+1}}{z_{m-i-1,m+i}} \right) + \frac{z_{m-i-1,m+i+1}}{\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(m-i,m+i)(\mathbf{z})} \\
&= \left(-\frac{\widetilde{z}_{m-i-2,m+i+1}}{\widetilde{z}_{m-i-1,m+i+1}} + \frac{\widetilde{z}_{m-i-1,m+i+1}}{\widetilde{z}_{m-i-1,m+i}} \right) + \frac{\widetilde{z}_{m-i-1,m+i+1}}{\widetilde{z}_{m-i,m+i}} \cdot \frac{Q_i(a)}{P_i(a)},
\end{aligned}$$

which is also a non-constant rational function. Similarly, one can see that $\widetilde{\partial^{\mathfrak{b}}_m}(m+i,m-i)(\mathbf{z})$ is also a non-constant rational function for $i \geq 1$. Thus, (11.17) is established if choosing a generically. □

We are ready to prove Proposition 11.4 for the case where $n = 2k$ and $m = k := \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

Proof of Proposition 11.4 (continued). By Lemma 11.15, we choose $d_{i,m+1} := a \cdot \widetilde{z}_{i,m+1}$ from (11.16) as a generic seed. It complete the proof. □

11.4. **Proof of Theorem 8.6.**

Finally, we are wrapping up the proof of Theorem 8.6.

Proof of Theorem 8.6. By Corollary 11.5, the split leading term equation (10.6) has a desired solution for some nonzero complex numbers $c^{\mathrm{ver},\mathbb{C}}_{i+1,i}$'s and $c^{\mathrm{hor},\mathbb{C}}_{j,j+1}$'s ($i,j \geq k$). Theorem 10.7 convinces us that for each Lagrangian torus $L_m(t)$ ($0 \leq t < 1$), there exists a suitable bulk-deformation parameter $\mathfrak{b}$ of the form (9.8) so that the bulk-deformed potential function admits a critical point. By Theorem 9.7, each Gelfand-Cetlin torus fiber $L_m(t)$ for $0 \leq t < 1$ is non-displaceable. Furthermore, Corollary 4.23 and Lemma 9.13 imply that $L_m(1)$ is Lagrangian and non-displaceable. Finally, $L_m(1)$ is diffeomorphic to $U(m) \times T^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}-m^2}$ because of Theorem 6.8. This finishes the proof of Theorem 8.6.

□

APPENDIX A. CALCULATION OF POTENTIAL FUNCTION DEFORMED BY SCHUBERT CYCLES

The potential function *with bulk* we use in the present paper was first constructed in [FOOO1, Section 3.8.5, 3.8.6] and was explicitly computed in [FOOO4, Section 3] for the toric case. (See [FOOO4, Proposition 4.7] for the precise toric counterpart.) Since the main steps of the derivation of (A.10) are the same as that of the proof of [FOOO4, Proposition 4.7] given in Section 7 therein, we will only explain modifications we need to make to apply them to the current Gelfand-Cetlin case. Also for the purpose of proving Theorem A.6 in the present paper, the facts that X_ϵ is Fano and that we have only to consider complex divisors, i.e., $\mathscr{D}_j$ of real codimension 2 also help us to simplify the study of holomorphic discs contributing to the potential functions.

In this section, we provide main modifications needed to overcome the two issues that the Schubert divisor $\mathscr{D}_j$ may neither be smooth nor torus-invariant. These two are main differences between the present case and the case of toric divisors in toric manifolds considered in [FOOO4].

We start with notations. Let L be a Lagrangian submanifold in a symplectic manifold X. Let $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta)$ denote the moduli space of stable maps in the class $\beta \in \pi_2(X, L)$ from a bordered Riemann surface Σ of genus zero with $(k+1)$ marked points $\{z_s\}_{s=0}^{k+1}$ on the boundary $\partial\Sigma$ respecting the counter-clockwise orientation and ℓ marked points $\{z_r^+\}_{r=1}^{\ell}$ at the interior of Σ. It naturally comes with two types of evaluation maps, at i-th boundary marked point

$$\text{(A.1)} \qquad \text{ev}_i \colon \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta) \to L; \quad \text{ev}_i\left([\varphi \colon \Sigma \to X, \{z_s\}_{s=0}^{k+1}, \{z_r^+\}_{r=1}^{\ell}]\right) = \varphi(z_i)$$

and at the j-th interior marked point

$$\text{(A.2)} \qquad \text{ev}_j^{\text{int}} \colon \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta) \to X; \quad \text{ev}_j^{\text{int}}\left([\varphi \colon \Sigma \to X, \{z_s\}_{s=0}^{k+1}, \{z_r^+\}_{r=1}^{\ell}]\right) = \varphi(z_j^+).$$

Set $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X, L; \beta) := \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell=0}(X, L; \beta)$, the moduli space without interior marked points. Let $\mathbf{ev}_+ := (\text{ev}_1, \cdots, \text{ev}_k)$.

Recall that an A_∞ structure $\mathfrak{m}_k = \sum_\beta \mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta} \cdot T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi}$ with the operators

$$\mathfrak{m}_{k,\beta}(b_1, \cdots, b_k) := (\text{ev}_0)!(\mathbf{ev}_+)^*(\pi_1^* b_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_k^* b_k)$$

on the de Rham complex $\Omega(L)$ is defined via the smooth correspondence

$$\text{(A.3)} \qquad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X, L; \beta) & & \\ & \overset{\mathbf{ev}_+}{\swarrow} & & \overset{\text{ev}_0}{\searrow} & \\ L^k & & & & L \end{array}$$

and a choice of compatible systems of Kuranishi structures and CF-perturbations where $\pi_i \colon L^k \to L$ denotes the projection to the i-th copy of L. (See [Fuk, Corollary 3.1] for the details of construction of such a system of Kuranishi structures and CF-perturbtations on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X, L; \beta)$'s in general. In [Fuk], the old term 'a continuous family of multi-sections' was used, but here we use the simplified term 'CF-perturbtation' which was adopted in [FOOO6] and used such as in [FOOO8] and other later works by Fukaya-Oh-Ohta-Ono. We refer [FOOO6] for the precise definition [FOOO6, Definition 7.3] of CF-perturbtation and its basic properties.)

We now recall Nishinou-Nohara-Ueda's computation of the potential function of $L_\varepsilon \subset X_\varepsilon$ in [NNU1]. Nishinou-Nohara-Ueda [NNU1] were able to exploit the presence of toric degeneration of X_ϵ to X_0 in their computation the explanation of which is now in order. For the study of holomorphic discs in X_0 which is not smooth, they used the following notion in Nishinou-Siebert [NS].

Definition A.1 (Definition 4.1 in [NS]). A holomorphic curve in a toric variety X is called *torically transverse* if it is disjoint from all toric strata of codimension greater than one. A stable map $\varphi \colon \Sigma \to X$ is *torically transverse* if $\varphi(\Sigma) \subset X$ is torically transverse and $\varphi^{-1}(\text{Int}\, X) \subset \Sigma$ is dense. Here, $\text{Int}\, X$ is the complement of the toric divisors in X.

We denote by $S_0 := \text{Sing}(X_0)$ the singular locus of X_0. Using the classification result [CO] of holomorphic discs attached to Lagranigian torus fiber in a smooth toric manifold and the property of the small resolution, Nishinou-Nohara-Ueda [NNU1] proved the following.

Lemma A.2 (Proposition 9.5 and Lemma 9.15 in [NNU1]). *Any holomorphic disc $\varphi \colon (\mathbb{D}^2, \partial\mathbb{D}^2) \to (X_0, L_0)$ can be deformed into a holomorphic disc with the same boundary condition that is torically transverse. Furthermore the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_1(X_0, L_0; \beta)$ is empty if the Maslov index of β is less than two.*

Lemma A.3 (Lemma 9.9 in [NNU1]). *There is a small neighborhood W_0 of the singular locus $S_0 \subset X_0$ such that no holomorphic discs of Maslov index two intersect W_0.*

Now let $\phi'_\varepsilon \colon X_\varepsilon \to X_0$ be a (continuous) extension of the flow $\phi_\varepsilon \colon X_\varepsilon^{\text{sm}} \to X_0^{\text{sm}}$ given in Theorem 9.1 ([NNU1, Section 8]). The following is the key proposition which relates the above mentioned holomorphic discs in (X_0, L_0) to those of $(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon)$.

Proposition A.4 (Proposition 9.16 in [NNU1]). *For any $\beta \in \pi_2(X_0, L_0)$ of Maslov index two, there is a positive real numbers $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and a diffeomorphism*

$$\psi \colon \mathcal{M}_1(X_0, L_0; \beta) \to \mathcal{M}_1(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta)$$

such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_*(\mathcal{M}_1(X_0, L_0; \beta)) & \xrightarrow{(\mathrm{ev}_0)_*} & H_*(L_0) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \psi_*} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle (\phi_\varepsilon)_*^{-1}} \\ H_*(\mathcal{M}_1(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta)) & \xrightarrow{(\mathrm{ev}_0)_*} & H_*(L_\varepsilon) \end{array}$$

is commutative.

Lemma A.5 (Lemma 9.22 in [NNU1]). *Let $W_\varepsilon := (\phi'_\varepsilon)^{-1}(W_0)$. There exists $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for all $0 < \varepsilon \leq \varepsilon_0$, any holomorphic curve bounded by L_ε in a class of Maslov index two does not intersect W_ε*

We now combine the diffeomorphism $\psi \colon \mathcal{M}_1(X_0, L_0; \beta) \to \mathcal{M}_1(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta)$ and $\phi'_\varepsilon : X_0 \to X_\varepsilon$ to define an isomorphism between the correspondence (A.4)

(A.4)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X_0, L_0; \beta) & \\ {\scriptstyle \mathbf{ev}_+} \swarrow & & \searrow {\scriptstyle \mathrm{ev}_0} \\ L_0^k & & L_0 \end{array}$$

and the following correspondence (A.5)

(A.5)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta) & \\ {\scriptstyle \mathbf{ev}_+} \swarrow & & \searrow {\scriptstyle \mathrm{ev}_0} \\ L_\varepsilon^k & & L_\varepsilon \end{array} .$$

Although they did not explicitly mention a choice of compatible systems of Kuranishi structures or perturbations, Nishinou-Nohara-Ueda [NNU1] essentially constructed an A_∞-structure on $L_\varepsilon \subset X_\epsilon$ and computed its potential function in the same way as on a Fano toric manifolds [CO, FOOO3] using Proposition A.4. We denote the corresponding compatible system of CF-perturbations by $\mathfrak{s}_{k+1,\beta;\varepsilon}$. (See [FOOO6, Section 7.2] for the meaning of this notation. We note that the constant ε here and the constant ϵ appearing in [FOOO6, Section 7.2] are not related to each other.)

Next we need to involve bulk deformations for our purpose of a construction of continuum of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori in X, whose construction is now in order.

Denote $\mathscr{A}^2_{GS}(\mathbb{Z})$ be the free abelian group generated by the horizontal and vertical Schubert divisors

(A.6)
$$\{\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} : 1 \leq i \leq n-1\} \cup \{\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j} : 1 \leq j \leq n-1\}.$$

We recall

(A.7)
$$L \cap \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} = \emptyset = L \cap \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$$

for any i, j and so the cap product of $\beta \in \pi_2(X, L)$ with any element thereof is well-defined. Putting $\mathscr{A}^2_{GS}(\Lambda_0) := \mathscr{A}^2_{GS}(\mathbb{Z}) \otimes \Lambda_0$, any element $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathscr{A}^2_{GS}(\Lambda_0)$ can be expressed as

(A.8)
$$\mathfrak{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j,j+1} \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j,j+1} \in \Lambda_0$. We formally denote

(A.9)
$$\beta \cap \mathfrak{b} = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1} \left(\beta \cap \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}\right) + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j,j+1} \left(\beta \cap \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}\right).$$

For simplicity, let us fix an enumeration $\{\mathscr{D}_j \mid j = 1, \cdots, B\}$ of the elements in (A.6) where $B = 2(n-2)$ and set $\mathfrak{b}_j$ to be the coefficient corresponding to $\mathscr{D}_j$ in (A.8).

The following is the statement of the counterpart of Theorem 9.6 which contains full details for the case of general smooth toric manifolds in Section 3, 4, 6, and 7 from [FOOO4].

Theorem A.6. *Let $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathscr{A}^2_{GS}(\Lambda_0)$ and let L be a Gelfand-Cetlin torus Lagrangian fiber of Φ_λ in $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. Then, the bulk-deformed potential function is written as*

$$\mathfrak{PO}^{\mathfrak{b}}(L;b) = \sum_{\beta} \exp(\beta \cap \mathfrak{b}) \cdot \exp(\partial\beta \cap b)\, T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi}. \tag{A.10}$$

where the summation is taken over all homotopy classes in $\pi_2(\mathcal{O}_\lambda, L)$ of Maslov index 2.

Since each $\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{hor}}_{i,i+1}$ (or $\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{ver}}_{j+1,j}$) represents a Schubert cocycle in $H^2(X)$, one can equip an A_∞-algebra *with bulk* on L, see [FOOO1, FOOO4, FOOO7]. We would like to calculate the bulk-deformed potential function explicitly.

We put $\underline{B} = \{1, \ldots, B\}$ and denote the set of all maps $\mathbf{p}\colon \{1, \ldots, \ell\} \to \underline{B}$ by $Map(\ell, \underline{B})$. We write $|\mathbf{p}| = \ell$ if $\mathbf{p} \in Map(\ell, \underline{B})$. Setting $\mathbf{ev}^{\mathrm{int}} := (\mathrm{ev}^{\mathrm{int}}_1, \ldots, \mathrm{ev}^{\mathrm{int}}_\ell)$, We define a fiber product

$$\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta; \mathbf{p}) := \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta)_{\mathbf{ev}^{\mathrm{int}}} \times_{X^\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathscr{D}_{\mathbf{p}(i)} \tag{A.11}$$

and then (A.1) induces $\mathrm{ev}_i\colon \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X, L; \beta; \mathbf{p}) \to L$. Let $\mathbf{ev}_+ := (\mathrm{ev}_1, \cdots, \mathrm{ev}_k)$.

For the purpose of outlining the proof of Theorem A.6, we will be particularly interested in homotopy classes of Maslov index two as we have taken a combination of *divisors* in order to deform the potential function $\mathfrak{PO}$. Since every Schubert variety is normal, see [Bri] for instance, the singular locus of $\mathscr{D}_\bullet$ has the (complex) codimension ≥ 2. By Lemma A.5, for a class β with $\mu(\beta) = 2$, we observe that

$$\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p}) = \mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta)_{\mathbf{ev}^{\mathrm{int}}} \times_{X_\varepsilon^\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{sm}}_{\mathbf{p}(i)} \tag{A.12}$$

where $\mathscr{D}^{\mathrm{sm}}_\bullet := \mathscr{D}_\bullet \backslash (\phi'_\varepsilon)^{-1}(S_0)$. Consider a system of Kuranishi structures on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta)$'s constructed in [Fuk, Corollary 3.1]. Then, as in [FOOO7, Section 4.3.6] (without requiring torus equivariance), one can extend the structures to those on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p})$ using (A.12).

Keeping in mind that X_ε is Fano, Lemma A.2 and (A.7) yield that $\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon, \beta; \mathbf{p})$ is empty if one of the followings is satisfied.

$$\begin{cases} (1)\ \mu(\beta) < 0, \\ (2)\ \mu(\beta) = 0 \text{ and } \beta \neq 0, \\ (3)\ \beta = 0 \text{ and } l > 0. \end{cases} \tag{A.13}$$

Without perturbing those moduli spaces, we obtain the followings.

Lemma A.7 (Lemma 3.2.6 in [FOOO7])**.** *There exists a CF-perturbation $\mathfrak{s} = \{\mathfrak{s}_{k+1,\beta;\mathbf{p}}\}$ on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p})$ such that for all classes β with $\mu(\beta) \leq 2$,*

1. *The CF-perturbation is transversal to 0.*
2. *The evaluation map $\mathrm{ev}_0\colon \mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}} \to L$ is a submersion.*
3. *It is invariant under the action of the symmetric group exchaging the interior marked points and the factors of $\mathbf{p}$.*
4. *It is compatible with the forgetful map $\mathfrak{forget}_{k+1;1}\colon \mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}} \to \mathcal{M}_{1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}}$ which forgets the 1st, 2nd,$\cdots$ and kth boundary marked points and then collapses the unstable components.*
5. *It is compatible with other CF-perturbations given along the boundary.*
6. *$\mathcal{M}_{k+1;\ell}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon, \beta; \mathbf{p})^{\mathfrak{s}}$ is still empty if one of (A.13) holds.*
7. *It extends the above chosen $\{\mathfrak{s}_{k+1,\beta}\}$ on $\mathcal{M}_{k+1}(X_\varepsilon, L_\epsilon; \beta)$ to $\mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p})$.*

In order to see details, the reader is referred to [Fuk, Section 4] and [FOOO7, Section 3.2]. Applying a smooth correspondence in [FOOO4, Section 12] to

(A.14)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{M}_{k+1,l}(X_\varepsilon, L_\varepsilon; \beta; \mathbf{p}) & \\ {\scriptstyle \mathbf{ev}_+}\swarrow & & \searrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{ev}_0} \\ L^k & & L \end{array}$$

we define

$$\mathfrak{q}_{k,\ell;\beta}\left(\mathbf{p}; b^{\otimes k}\right) := (\mathrm{ev}_0)!\left(\mathbf{ev}_+^*(\pi_1^* b \otimes \cdots \otimes \pi_k^* b)\right).$$

Because of (4) in Lemma A.7, we have

(A.15)
$$\mathfrak{q}_{k,\ell;\beta}\left(\mathbf{p}; b^{\otimes k}\right) = \frac{1}{k!}(\partial\beta \cap b)^k \cdot \mathfrak{q}_{0,\ell;\beta}\left(\mathbf{p}; 1\right).$$

Note that (5) and (6) in Lemma A.7 yield that $\mathfrak{q}_{0,\ell;\beta}(\mathbf{p}; 1)$ represents a cycle, whose dimension is $\dim L$. Passing to the canonical model [FOOO1, FOOO2], we obtain that

(A.16)
$$\mathfrak{q}_{0,\ell;\beta}(\mathbf{p}; 1) = n_\beta(\mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathrm{PD}[L]$$

for some $n_\beta(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathbb{Q}$, consult [FOOO5, Appendix A] to see why (A.16) is true. As a consequence, we obtain that every 1-cochain is a weak bounding cochain with respect to $\mathfrak{b}$. In particular, the potential function with bulk is defined on $H^1(L_\varepsilon; \Lambda_+)$.

Under our situation, $n_\beta(\mathbf{p})$ is well-defined. Especially when $\dim \mathscr{D}_\bullet = 2n-2$, $\mu(\beta) = 2$, we recall that this is precisely the situation where the divisor axiom of the Gromov-Witten theory applies, see [FOOO4, Lemma 9.2]. In particualr, we can calculate $n_\beta(\mathbf{p})$ in the homology level and therefore

(A.17)
$$n_\beta(\mathbf{p}) = n_\beta \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{p}|}\left(\beta \cap \mathscr{D}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}\right).$$

Following [FOOO4, Section 7] and using (A.15), (A.16), (A.17) and (A.9), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathfrak{m}_k^{\mathfrak{b}}\left(b^{\otimes k}\right) &:= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\sum_{\beta;\mu(\beta)=2} \frac{1}{\ell!}\, \mathfrak{q}_{k,\ell;\beta}\left(\mathfrak{b}^{\otimes \ell}; b^{\otimes k}\right) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \\
&= \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\sum_{\mathbf{p};|\mathbf{p}|=\ell}\sum_{\beta;\mu(\beta)=2} \exp\left(\partial\beta \cap b\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\ell!}\, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}}\, \mathfrak{q}_{0,\ell;\beta}\left(\mathbf{p}; 1\right) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \\
&= \sum_{\beta;\mu(\beta)=2}\left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\sum_{\mathbf{p};|\mathbf{p}|=\ell} \exp\left(\partial\beta \cap b\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\ell!}\, \mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}}\, n_\beta(\mathbf{p})\right) T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \cdot PD[L] \\
&= \sum_{\beta;\mu(\beta)=2} n_\beta \cdot \left(\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\ell!}\sum_{\mathbf{p};|\mathbf{p}|=\ell}\prod_{i=1}^{|\mathbf{p}|}\mathfrak{b}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}\left(\beta \cap \mathscr{D}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}\right)\right) \cdot \exp(\partial\beta \cap b)\ \cdot T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \cdot PD[L] \\
&= \sum_{\beta;\mu(\beta)=2} n_\beta \cdot \exp\left(\beta \cap \mathfrak{b}\right) \cdot \exp(\partial\beta \cap b)\ \cdot T^{\omega(\beta)/2\pi} \cdot PD[L]
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathbf{p}} = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell}\mathfrak{b}_{\mathbf{p}(i)}$. Finally, incorporating with deformation of non-unitary flat line bundle by Cho [Cho2], we can extend the domain of the bulk-deformed potential function to $H^1(L_\varepsilon; \Lambda_0)$. Because of Proposition A.4, we have $n_\beta = 1$ and thus, (A.10) is derived.

REFERENCES

[ABM] Miguel Abreu, Matthew Borman, Dusa McDuff, *Displacing Lagrangian toric fibers by extended probes.* Algebr. Geom. Topol. **14** (2014), no. 2, 687–752.

[ACK] Byung Hee An, Yunhyung Cho, and Jang Soo Kim, *On the f-vectors of Gelfand-Cetlin polytopes.* preprint(2016), arXiv:1606.05957

[At] Michael Atiyah, *Convexity and commuting Hamiltonians.* Bull. London Math. Soc. **14** (1982), 1–15.

[Au] Michéle Audin, *Topology of Torus actions on symplectic manifolds Second revised edition.* Progress in Mathematics, **93**. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel (2004).

[BCKV] Victor Batyrev, Ionuţ Ciocan-Fontanine, Bumsig Kim, Duco van Straten, *Mirror symmetry and toric degenerations of partial flag manifolds.* Acta Math., **184** (1) (2000), 1-39.

[Be] D. N. Bernstein, *The number of roots of a system of equations.* Functional Anal. Appl. **9** (1975), no. 3, (1976) 183–185.

[Bri] Michel Brion, *Lectures on the geometry of flag varieties. Topics in cohomological studies of algebraic varieties.* 33–85, Trends Math., Birkhäuser, Basel, (2005).

[Br] Robert Bryant, *An introduction to Lie groups and symplectic geometry Geometry and quantum field theory (Park City, UT, 1991).* 5–181, IAS/Park City Math. Ser., **1**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1995).

[Cho1] Cheol-Hyun Cho, *Holomorphic discs, spin structures and the Floer cohomology of the Clifford torus.* Int. Math. Res. Not. **35** (2004), 1803-1843.

[Cho2] Cheol-Hyun Cho, *Non-displaceable Lagrangian submanifolds and Floer cohomology with non-unitary line bundle.* J. Geom. Phys. **58** (2008), no. 11, 1465–1476.

[CO] Cheol-Hyun Cho, Yong-Geun Oh *Floer cohomology and disc instantons of Lagrangian torus fibers in Fano toric manifolds*, Asian J. Math. **10** (2006), no. 4, 773–814.

[CP] Cheol-Hyun Cho, Mainak Poddar, *Holomorphic orbi-discs and Lagrangian Floer cohomology of symplectic toric orbifolds.* J. Differential Geom. **98** (2014), no. 1, 21–116.

[CKO] Yunhyung Cho, Yoosik Kim, Yong-Geun Oh, *Monotone Lagrangian tori in cotangent bundles.* preprint.

[CK] Yunhyung Cho, Yoosik Kim, *Classification of Lagrangian fibers of Gelfand-Cetlin systems : SO(n)-types.* in preparation.

[EL] Jonathan Evans, Yanki Evans, *Floer cohomology of the Chiang Lagrangian.* Selecta Math. (N.S.) **21** (2015), no. 4, 1361–1404.

[EP1] Michael Entov, Leonid Polterovich, *Quasi-states and symplectic intersections.* Comment. Math. Helv. **81** (2006), no. 1, 75–99.

[EP2] Michael Entov, Leonid Polterovich, *Rigid subsets of symplectic manifolds.* Compos. Math. **145** (2009), no. 3, 773–826.

[Ful] William Fulton, *Young Tableaux*, London Math. Soc. Stud. Texts **35**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, (1997).

[Fuk] Kenji Fukaya, *Cyclic symmetry and adic convergence in Lagrangian Floer theory.* Kyoto J. Math. **50** (2010), no. 3, 521–590.

[FOOO1] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Lagrangian intersection Floer theory: anomaly and obstruction. Part I* & *Part II.* AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Math., **46**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI; International Press, Somerville, MA, (2009).

[FOOO2] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Canonical models of filtered A_∞-algebras and Morse complexes.* New perspectives and challenges in symplectic field theory, 201–227, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes, **49**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (2009).

[FOOO3] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds. I.* Duke Math. J. **151** (2010), no. 1, 23–174.

[FOOO4] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Lagrangian Floer theory on compact toric manifolds II: bulk deformations.* Selecta Math. (N.S.) **17** (2011), no. 3, 609–711.

[FOOO5] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Toric degeneration and nondisplaceable Lagrangian tori in $S^2 \times S^2$.* Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2012), **13**, 2942–2993.

[FOOO6] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Kuranishi structure, pseudoholomophric curve, and virtual fundamental chain: Part 1*, preprint(2015), arXiv:1503.5123.

[FOOO7] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Lagrangian Floer theory and mirror symmetry on compact toric manifolds.* Astérisque **376** (2016).

[FOOO8] Kenji Fukaya, Yong-Geun Oh, Hiroshi Ohta, Kaoru Ono, *Spectral invariants with bulk, quasimorphisms and Lagrangian Floer theory.* preprint(2011) arXiv:1105.5123, to appear in Memoirs of the AMS.

[GL] Nicolae Gonciulea, Venkatramani Lakshmibai, *Degenerations of flag and Schubert varieties to toric varieties.* Transform. Groups **1** (1996), no. 3, 215–248.

[GS1] Victor Guillemin, Shlomo Sternberg, *Convexity properties of the moment mapping.* Invent. Math. **67** (1982), 491–513.

[GS2] Victor Guillemin, Shlomo Sternberg, *The Gel'fand-Cetlin system and quantization of the complex flag manifolds.* J. Funct. Anal. **52** (1983) no. 1, 106–128.

[HJ] Roger Horn, Charles Johnson, *Matrix analysis.Second edition.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2013).

[HK] Megumi Harada, Kiumars Kaveh, *Integrable systems, toric degenerations and Okounkov bodies.* Invent. Math. **202** (2015), no. 3, 927–985.

[KL] Yoosik Kim, Jaeho Lee, *Non-displaceable toric fibers on compact toric manifolds via tropicalizations*, preprint (2015), arXiv:1507.06132.

[Ko] Mikhail Kogan, *Schubert geometry of flag varieties and Gelfand-Cetlin theory.* Thesis (Ph.D.) Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 2000.

[KnM] Allen Knutson, Ezra Miller, *Gröbner geometry of Schubert polynomials.* Ann. of Math. (2) **161** (2005), no. 3, 1245–1318.

[KoM] Mikhail Kogan, Ezra Miller, *Toric degeneration of Schubert varieties and Gelfand-Tsetlin polytopes.* Adv. Math. **193** (2005), no. 1, 1–17.

[Ku] A. G. Kušnirenko, *Newton polyhedra and Bezout's theorem.* Functional Anal. Appl. **10** (1976), no. 3, 233–235.

[LS] Eugene Lerman, Reyer Sjamaar, *Stratified symplectic spaces and reduction.* Ann. of Math. (2) **134** (1991), no. 2, 375–422.

[McD] Dusa McDuff, *Displacing Lagrangian toric fibers via probes.*, Low-dimensional and symplectic topology, 131–160, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., **82**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (2011).

[NNU1] Takeo Nishinou, Yuichi Nohara, Kazushi Ueda, *Toric degenerations of Gelfand-Cetlin systems and potential functions.* Adv. Math. **224** (2) (2010), 648–706.

[NNU2] Takeo Nishinou, Yuichi Nohara, Kazushi Ueda, *Potential functions via toric degenerations.* Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **88** (2012), no. 2, 31–33.

[NS] Takeo Nishinou, Bernd Siebert, *Toric degenerations of toric varieties and tropical curves.* Duke Math. J. **135** (1) (2006), 1–51.

[NU1] Yuichi Nohara, Kazushi Ueda, *Floer homology for the Gelfand-Cetlin system. Real and complex submanifolds.* Springer Proc. Math. Stat., **106**, Springer, Tokyo (2014), 427–436.

[NU2] Yuichi Nohara, Kazushi Ueda, *Floer cohomologies of non-torus fibers of the Gelfand-Cetlin system.* J. Symplectic. Geom. **14** (2016), No. 4, 1251–1293.

[Pa] Milena Pabiniak, *Displacing (Lagrangian) submanifolds in the manifolds of full flags.* Adv. Geom. **15** (2015), no. 1, 101–108.

[Ru] Wei-Dong Ruan, *Lagrangian torus fibration of quintic Calabi-Yau hypersurfaces. II. Technical results on gradient flow construction.* J. Symplectic Geom. **1** (2002), no. 3, 435–521.

[St] Norman Steenrod, *The topology of fibre bundles. Reprint of the 1957 edition.* Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton Paperbacks. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, (1999).

[Th] William Thurston, *Some simple examples of symplectic manifolds.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **55** (1976), no. 2, 467–468.

[Vi] Renato Vianna, *Continuum families of non-displaceable Lagrangian tori in* $(\mathbb{C}P^1)^{2m}$. preprint(2016), arXiv:1603.02006.

[WW] Glen Wilson, Chris Woodward, *Quasimap Floer cohomology for varying symplectic quotients.* Canad. J. Math. **65** (2013), no. 2, 467–480.

[Wo] Chris Woodward, *Gauged Floer theory of toric moment fibers.* Geom. Funct. Anal. **21** (2011), no. 3, 680–749.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS EDUCATION, SUNGKYUNKWAN UNIVERSITY, SEOUL, REPUBLIC OF KOREA.
E-mail address: yunhyung@skku.edu

CENTER FOR GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE (IBS), POHANG, REPUBLIC OF KOREA.
E-mail address: kimyoosik27@gmail.com, yoosik@ibs.re.kr

CENTER FOR GEOMETRY AND PHYSICS, INSTITUTE FOR BASIC SCIENCE (IBS), POHANG, REPUBLIC OF KOREA, AND DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, POSTECH, POHANG, REPUBLIC OF KOREA
E-mail address: yongoh1@postech.ac.kr